Rev.d Leonard Jenyns.

GEORGE GREGORY,
Bookseller to
H.M. Queen Alexandra,
BATH

Contents.

(1) - The Unity of the Church. — A Sermon preacht at Brighton, Dec. 10. 1840. —

(2) - The Means of Unity. — A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lewes, — 1842. —

(3) - A Letter to the Very Reverend the Dean of Chichester on the agitation excited by the appointment of Dr Hampden to the See of Hereford. — 1848.

(4) - The Duty of the Church in Times of Trial. A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lewes, in 1848.

(5) - The True Remedy for the Evils of the Age. — A Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Lewes, in 1849

(6) - A Letter to the Hon. Richard Cavendish on the Recent Judgment of the Court of Appeal, as affecting the Doctrine of the Church. — 1850. —

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH:

A SERMON PREACHT

AT ST PETER'S CHURCH, BRIGHTON,

ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1840,

AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE CHICHESTER DIOCESAN ASSOCIATION:

WITH SOME INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON UNIFORMITY:

BY JULIUS CHARLES HARE,

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES.

LONDON:

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

M.DCCC.XLV.

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, and Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

PREFACE.

This Sermon, with the Dedication which precedes it, has been in print this year and a half, as part of a volume, the publication of which has been delayed by a variety of causes. Its appearance by itself at present is occasioned by the advice of some friends, for whose wisdom I am bound to feel the highest reverence, and who have thought it might be of service in helping to allay the calamitous dissensions in our Church.

The rock on which we are splitting now, as we have been again and again, ever since our Church asserted her national independence at the Reformation, is the notion that the only way of preserving the Unity of the Church is by enforcing a rigid Uniformity. This notion has been maintained with a singular consistency and pertinacity by the chief part of the persons who have been called to exercise authority in our Church during the last three centuries; and the recent agitation has shewn how widely it is spread at this day. Were a judgement formed from the opinions which have found vent on this occasion, on whatsoever side, and from whatsoever position, at least among the clergy, it would seem to be held by all as an uncontroverted and incontrovertible truth, a truth so plain and self-evident as to need no argument for its demonstration; which in one point of view is lucky for it, as assuredly it is indemonstrable. Yet, so far is it from being a universal

truth, or even an opinion to which man is universally led by the tendencies of his nature, that the English branch of the Church since the Reformation is the one sole portion of the whole Church, which has brought this notion prominently forward as the regulative principle of her policy. The wiser principle of the universal Church, the principle which she has recognized speculatively, and which she has in great measure desired to realize practically, is that exprest in the celebrated threefold maxim, *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas:* and this is in exact accordance with the spirit of the Apostolic Epistles, to which our rigid enforcement of uniformity is utterly repugnant. Even the Church of Rome, in those ages when she was most imperiously wielding her usurpt dominion over Western Christendom, being ever largely endowed with the wisdom of the serpent,—a wisdom which indeed seems almost natural to the Italian intellect,—acted far more judiciously than we have done in this respect. Though she oppressively curtailed the *libertas*, which ought to have been allowed in doubtful things, she was too sagacious not to discern that the multitudinous combinations of the elements of human nature are not, all and each, to be shaped in a single mould, but require a multiplicity of institutions, and divers modes of training, and divers spheres to act in, if the powers dormant in them are to be drawn forth for their own good and that of the community. And with reference to our immediate subject, we are told in the Preface to our Common Prayer, that "heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm: some following Salisbury Use, some Hereford Use, and some the Use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln."

It would seem owing to that want of any distinctive religious principle, and that spirit of compromise, which characterize our Reformation, that, inasmuch as there was no one mighty inward power, which might have formed a living source of unity, our ecclesiastical rulers fancied themselves compelled to impose some uniting bond from without. The actuating idea of our Reformation, the idea which exercised the chief influence in determining the course of events, being the nationality of our Church, and its consequent independence of all forein dominion, far more stress was laid in England, than in the other countries which vindicated their Christian liberty at the Reformation, on the union between the Church and the State. Thus the State came to act a principal part in regulating the concerns of the Church; and the ordinary mode in which the State acts is by Law. But Law is essentially rigid and compulsory; wherefore its appropriate office is vetative and prohibitive. This very rigidity unfits it for such delicate tasks as that of propagating and nurturing and shaping anything so tender and variable and multiform as life, above all, religious life. It should be content with its twofold work, that of repressing evil, and thereby fencing in and protecting the ground on which good is to grow. Hence, as Law makes no distinctions, and as the Liturgy was to be imposed by Law, it could not but happen, even without any excessive arbitrariness on the part of the legislators, that the Act by which the Liturgy was imposed became an Act of Uniformity. Moreover the Government, sharing in the common proneness of mankind to invert the right order of things, and to fancy that the heart and the will are to be moulded and controlled by outward force, deemed that, if it could ensure the submission of its

subjects to one prescribed form of worship, it should thereby secure their obedience and allegiance. At all events the notion of the indispensableness of Uniformity became more and more firmly establisht, until in the succeeding century it produced the most disastrous results: and yet even these did not avail to root it out of our Church.

That this notion is utterly groundless and delusive, I have endeavoured to shew in the Dedication prefixt to the following Sermon, not of course in the form of a systematic treatise, but following the line pointed out by the passage cited from the Charge of my most dear and honoured brother Archdeacon. The arguments brought forward might indeed be greatly strengthened; and with many they might carry more weight, if they were propt with a greater number of authorities: but when my cause is supported by the whole order of Nature, by the whole course of History, by Bacon, and by St Paul, I will not fear to incur the charge of presumption, though a thousand or ten thousand second and third-rate men should be summoned into court against me.

But though the question was discust without reference to the present disputes, it was not without a direct practical object. For in the discharge of my official duties I had several times been distrest by symptoms of a restless craving after uniformity in petty things; and I was afraid that this craving might lead to idle and vexatious bickerings. It was chiefly however from among the inferior Clergy that I apprehended such evils. I could not anticipate, more especially after the sad consequences which had ensued from a very cautious and temperate attempt to recommend ritual uniformity, that any person invested with authority in our Church, would risk her peace by

trying peremptorily to enforce what in itself is worthless, and cannot be enforced without vehement opposition. With my strong convictions on the subject, it is not to be wondered at that the very first announcement of this effort filled me with dread, and that I exclaimed that, if it were persisted in, it would probably drive three fourths of the Diocese into the arms of Dissent: and somewhat similar views, I found, were entertained by all the most judicious persons with whom I had the opportunity of conversing. Alas! our forebodings have been too rapidly and dismally justified. An angry, jealous spirit has been called up, which it will not be easy to lay; and among the miserable effects of this ill-fated measure, one is, that our rites and ceremonies are become a matter for ceaseless loquacious jangling with those who pour out their spleen and ignorance and impertinence into the sink of the daily press. They are the subject of idle disputatious talk at every breakfast-table, and in every pothouse; dissenters laugh in scornful triumph; and what can the dutiful son of the Church of England do, but mourn?

This disastrous controversy is, for the moment at least, one of the worst checks that has befallen the Church in our times; and it threatens to arrest the progress of the improvements which were gradually and not slowly spreading. A cry, almost a yell, has been set up by the lovers of anile torpour, and by those who are fond of letting the dust and cobwebs, which they would sweep out of their parlours, accumulate in their pews, to the effect that every change which has been made in the last ten or twenty years, must immediately be reverst, and that we must return to the decent quiet worship of the good old times. With this clamour, I trust, few will comply, none without strong

justifying cause. For let us not be deluded by an empty rigmarole phrase: let us say plainly, The old times referred to, generally speaking, with regard to the mode of carrying on the worship in our churches, were not good, but bad. Laxity, carelessness, irregularity were lamentably prevalent in the latter half of the last and the early part of this century: and even where things were in a better case, the other offices of the Church were often scarcely esteemed as more than subordinate preludes to the sermon. I will not dwell here on this matter; but I will add, on the strength of my own observation, confirmed by the evidence of every person with whom I have spoken on the subject, that great improvements, improvements acknowledged to be such by all the respectable members of the congregation, have been effected in this respect in a number of parishes within the last ten or twenty years. In proof of this let me cite the following statement from the Charge which the excellent Bishop of Salisbury delivered at his Visitation in 1842. Few things that I have read of late years, bearing on the condition of our Church, have seemed to me so cheering. "In this Diocese there are now two services on the Sunday in forty-two parishes, in which there was only single duty at my last Visitation; in sixty-five parishes, in which there was only one sermon, there are now every Sunday either two sermons, or,—what in country parishes is perhaps better,—instruction is given at one of the services catechetically, or by a lecture upon some portion of Scripture; the sacrament of Baptism is administered publicly during divine service, either always, or on certain definite occasions, in eighty-nine parishes, in which this used not to be the case; in many parishes the Holy Communion is celebrated much more frequently than formerly.

the administration of it occurring six, eight, or ten times a-year, or in many of the larger parishes, and in some even of the smaller villages, once in every month; there is an increasing sense of the propriety of distinguishing by their proper services at least the more important seasons of peculiar solemnity in the Church,—Ascension Day and Ash-Wednesday I may name as instances of days till of late, strange to say, almost universally neglected, and now, I trust, in the way of being before long universally observed; while in no inconsiderable number of parishes all the days specially appointed by the Church to be kept holy are markt by their appropriate services, and in some the full order of the Church in the daily service is maintained. I find too that in many quarters increasing efforts are being made to effect that most important as well as difficult object, the retaining the younger members of our flocks under the influence of religious instruction beyond that age, unhappily almost always a very tender age, at which they quit the daily school." The Bishop adds, "In some of the matters to which I have referred, I have been rather stating facts than giving advice; as I much prefer that changes, which must be deemed more or less experimental, should originate from the free will of those who are convinced of their advantage, rather than from any suggestions given by myself. Nor indeed am I prepared in my own judgement to lay down any rule in some of these points as of universal application." And he fully acknowledges that even these "are but the forms of godliness," and that, without the spirit of holiness, they may be merely "the savour of death unto death." Still we may reasonably cherish a hope that, when such improvements are made, and activity of this kind is increasing, the Spirit of Grace

will bless the work. At all events the passage shews that, where the work of improvement is carried on in the right method, not by a summary edict, but with a considerate adaptation to the wants of each particular parish, and where the alterations relate, not to frivolous externals of posture and vestment, which it is ever a stumblingblock to the pious and simplehearted to see raised into significance, but to matters of plain practical utility and expediency, such as may be recognized by the better part of the congregation, who always on the long run exercise the chief influence in it, a great deal may be accomplisht by quiet, unobtrusive, judicious perseverance even in the space of three years. And a like encouragement, as well as warning, is held out to us by the whole history of our Church. When its rulers desire to exert their authority for the furtherance of that which is felt to be morally and spiritually good, the hearts of men, as it were, leap up to meet them, and answer them readily and joyfully: but when the anxiety is only displayed for the upholding of outward unmeaning forms, this very anxiety gives offense, as having a savour of superstition; and the hearts of men recoil and resist.

At present a multitude of voices from all quarters are calling somewhat impatiently for a settlement of the questions which are disturbing the Church. Similar demands have found utterance every now and then for some years past; but they are now become louder and more frequent. Well, what do they mean? The unhappy issue of the attempts which have already been made to bring some of our minor differences to a settlement, proves that the demanders in point of fact want to have everything settled in their own way. However much they may differ from

each other, they join in this, every one desiring to have his own will, his own notions, his own fancies, set up as the law of the Church. If they can gain this one pet point, it matters not how, whether by persons possessing a rightful authority, or by persons who have none, whether by a Convocation, by a Synod of Bishops, by the Queen in Council, by an Ecclesiastical Commission, by an Act of Parliament, or by the suffrages of the people. Even the Pope would be tolerated, if he would consent to echo the wishes of the Pope within each man's breast. But let us ask a further question. To what end are these differences to be settled? In order that we may be at peace. Doubtless many a self-constituted legislator, when the winds are rushing along in their fury, or the waves are roaring and dashing beneath the violence of the storm, would gladly call in some charmer to lull them to rest. Many have thought that the world would be much happier and better, if the winds and waves could be hush't down to the rustle and ripple produced by a lady's fan. And what would be the result? That which is the only possible result of uniformity. — stagnation. The storms of the winds and waters are necessary to the purificatory processes of the universe. The father of poetry has taught us, that, even though all the winds were tied up in a bag, and entrusted to the keeping of the wisest and craftiest of men, who strains all his faculties in steering the vessel with unflagging vigilance day and night, sleep will some time or other come over him by the order of nature; and then his mischievous comrades let out the winds, which hurl the vessel away from its destined haven. It is only the aid of a higher power, that will avail *motos componere fluctus:* and for this we must wait patiently, each doing his duty in his

appointed station. Or, to take a page out of history, more than two hundred years ago it pleased King Charles, acting by the counsel of Bishop Laud, to declare his Royal will, that "in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years in different times and places exercised the Church of Christ, all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures." No doubt Charles had often thought, and it is not impossible may have been reminded by Laud himself, what a wise lesson Canute set to kings, when he shewed them how powerless they are to arrest the tide, even for an inch or an instant. Yet they deemed they could arrest a fiercer tide, which had been rolling, as they confess, for many centuries, under the sway of laws no less mighty and irreversible. This proclamation was issued in 1627, with what success the history of the next thirty years proves: and such will ever be the end of attempts to settle religious controversies by the interposition of authority.

One mode of settlement might indeed be beneficial, if there were any way of obtaining it, and any prospect; a settlement I mean, which, following the example of the Apostolic Council, would give an authoritative sanction to diversities. Still better would it be, though still less to be expected, if measures could be taken for expunging that hateful clause from the Act of Uniformity, by which its framers, of set purpose, drove the Puritans out of the Church. Much too were it to be wisht, that certain double forms of prayer might be introduced here and there for the relief of scrupulous consciences, painfully wounded by having to read offices which presuppose a totally

different state of discipline in the Church. But of these things there is little hope. The spirit of Catholic comprehension has seldom found a home in more than a very few hearts within our Church: the majority have mostly cared for little except maintaining their own position, in whatsoever manner, and however numerous the multitudes they might exclude from it. I do not mean, that the removal of hindrances and obstructions would of itself bring back our brethren, who have separated from us, into the pale of the Church. The awful words of the sleepwalking Queen, *What's done cannot be undone*, express the curse that follows every sinful act. Though we retrace our steps, we cannot regain our former position; for the world meanwhile has been rolling onward. Nor can the manifold feelings of bitterness and animosity and pride and self-will, which are generated and fostered by habitual schism, be stifled or eradicated in a moment. If our dissenting brethren are to be reclaimed, it must be the work of time, and can only be accomplisht by the preaching of the Gospel of truth and peace, and by proving that the Spirit does indeed dwell in the Church, manifesting Himself by works of holiness and love. But the taking down of the fences which have hitherto kept them out, so far as this may be done without injury to truth and order, is a requisite preparative for this work.

From the bottom of my heart however would I deprecate any attempt to put an end to our differences by establishing a stricter uniformity. To what end indeed should we do so? Do not our churches themselves teach us a very different lesson, if we cast our eyes around us in any part of the land? What rich varieties of form, and structure, and decoration, do we see in them! towers and spires, pinnacles

and parapets, from the majestic, awe-inspiring minster and cathedral, down to the little homely mother of the village, which looks like a hen gathering her chickens under her wings. Yet amid this endless variety what a sublime unity prevails! And who would exchange this beautiful diversity, even if it were practicable, for twelve thousand Brummagem churches, that should all lift up their heads in regimental uniformity, fac-similies one of another? Thus our churches themselves admonish us, that uniformity is not necessary to unity. Nay, even in the diversity of styles which we so often perceive in the same church, we may trace a higher unity, by which successive generations have been led to join in the same holy work. In the present day many of these churches have been greatly disfigured by the corruptions and the negligence of recent ages; and these disfigurements it behoves us to remove, not according to any one general sweeping plan, but by enquiring in each case what is requisite to fulfill the original idea. In like manner may the abuses, which have crept in through neglect, or whatsoever cause, into the celebration of divine worship, be corrected in each particular parish, mildly and gradually and peacefully, under the direction and guidance of the Bishop, according as occasion may require. And if some ritual differences still continue, I know not why, provided they are admitted to be lawful, these should excite any squabbles or animosities, any more than such ordinary facts, as that one church has a round arch, another a pointed.

Here let me be permitted to quote a passage from an unfinisht manuscript sermon of my brother's, which was preacht about a dozen years ago, and which may serve to shew how quietly and inoffensively certain ritual differences

were then allowed to subsist in neighbouring churches. His voice has spoken to many hearts; and not a few will perhaps feel a pleasure in recognizing his simple colloquial style, in the following attempt to give his congregation a notion of the manner in which the various Churches in Christendom unite to make up the Church or Kingdom of Christ. "The different Churches in the different countries of the world, to compare great things with small, are like the different parishes under one Bishop. The Bishopric of Salisbury for instance, in which we are living, reaches over the two counties of Wiltshire and Berkshire. In those two counties there are a great many parishes; and in each parish there is a separate congregation, with a place of worship of its own. Different parishes have different customs. In one parish there is an organ perhaps; in another there is only a village choir; in a third there is no music at all. Again, in one parish there may be two full services, in a second only one full service and prayers; in a third there may be church only once on a Sunday. It would be easy to point out other differences, were it of any use, such as slight differences of dress, one minister wearing a hood or scarf over his surplice, and another not; slight differences of prayers, some reading, as I do, the first prayer for the King in the Communion Service, and others reading the second; slight differences of custom, the Commandments being read in one parish from the Communion Table, and in another parish from the desk. These instances are enough to shew, that differences in smaller matters do exist, and are allowed to exist, in different parishes. In all these lesser points the minister of a parish is allowed to exercise his Christian liberty; nor can his brother minister in the next parish call him to account for so

doing. Still, with all these lesser and allowable differences in the several parishes of this Bishopric, the service on a Sunday morning or Sunday evening is on the main the same in all. Go into what Church you please, you will have the same Psalms, the same Lessons, the same Belief, the same Collects; and you will hear them following one another in the same order. Thus, with all the differences I have been speaking of, the form of worship throughout the whole Bishopric is, to all intents and purposes, the same. And notwithstanding their several differences, the several parishes are all united under the same head, and make one Bishopric under one Bishop."

Surely this is but the picture of a family: *Facies non omnibus una, Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum.* And supposing the great Apostle of the Gentiles had come to visit these churches, and had found these discrepancies amongst them, what, may we think, would he have done? Would he have exclaimed that such discrepancies are scandalous and intolerable, that they evince wilfulness and laxity and an open disregard of authority? or would he not have lookt upon them calmly and benignly, and said, *Go on, dear brethren in Christ Jesus, heirs of the glory to which He has called you; go on, each after his own manner, using those gifts and instruments in His service, which ye have received from the Father; go on, growing in faith, in obedience, in love toward Him and toward each other; and may the Spirit of Grace, and Truth, and Peace sanctify you, and all your acts and services, wholly against His coming.*

The question of authority has indeed been brought forward into painful prominence, as often before on similar occasions: yet I know not what can well be more unwise. Authority ought to act, not talk; to be felt rather than

heard. When it begins to prate of its rights, this is the crack which announces its fall. All the generative powers of nature work silently and invisibly; yet how wonderful and mighty are their effects! And what is the power of authority in the Church? Moral, not physical. It lies in the tacit, half unconscious recognition of the benefits which it produces, of the justice and wisdom with which it is exercised. But when it meddles with petty things, laying stress upon trifles, straining at gnats, and issuing mandates about the breadth of phylacteries, the instinctive sense of propriety and right revolts against it: and if it quotes texts to challenge obedience, its opponents will call to mind that there are other texts, equally plain and impressive, enjoining him that would be chief among the ministers of the Gospel, to be the servant of all, *even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered to, but to minister.*

This is the true foundation of the power of the Church: and when her power rests on this foundation, no man can rob her of it. O that the spirit from which such power springs, may be granted largely to the governors of our Church in this time of her need! O that they may be enricht with that true wisdom, that clear discernment between the form which killeth and the spirit which giveth life, and that living insight into the all-embracing fulness and all-reconciling freedom of the Gospel, which were vouchsafed so abundantly to St Paul!

J. C. H.

Conversion of St Paul, 1845.

TO THE VENERABLE

HENRY EDWARD MANNING,

ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.

My dear Friend,

In dedicating this Sermon to you, I am not influenced solely by the desire of giving utterance to my esteem and affection, and of connecting my name with yours, as it has pleased God in His lovingkindness to associate us, by ordaining that we should be the two eyes of the spiritual Father of this Diocese. Both the occasion when this Sermon was preacht, and the subject treated in it, almost constrain me to inscribe it with your name.

For to you, far more than to any other man,—after him who was its founder, and the instrument of this as well as of so many other blessings to his Diocese,—does our Association owe its original establishment, and whatever prosperity it may since have enjoyed. Your wisdom, under God, has been our chief guide; your eloquence has stirred our hearts; your loving spirit has checkt and healed the first outbreaks of anything like division. Thus since he, whom we both loved and revered as a father, was called to his reward, before our Annual Meeting was hallowed, as he had purpost that it should

be, for the first time with a religious service, the little offering, which would otherwise have belonged to him, falls by a sort of inheritance to you.

Moreover the very subject seems to mark it as rightfully yours. Unity, the Unity of the Church, is of all things the dearest to your heart, at least only subordinate to, or rather coordinate with Truth, without which, you well know, all Unity must be fallacious. And as that which fills the heart will overflow from the lips, you yourself, several times since this Sermon was preacht, have poured out your earnest thoughts and desires for the Unity of the Church. Your sermon at the next Anniversary of our Association was devoted in great part to setting forth the spiritual principle of Unity, how it is by putting on the Mind of Christ that we shall best seek Unity and ensue it, and how our dissensions and divisions arise from our want of that mind, and from our sins against it. More recently you have made the Unity of the Church the subject of an elaborate Treatise, in which, as in all your writings, the spirit of love speaks, but in the argumentative part of which, I grieve to say, there is much I am unable to go along with. A Dedication however would be a place ill-suited for discussing the differences between us: indeed to do so effectually might require a volume scarcely inferior in bulk to your own; and the following Sermon may suggest certain points at which we diverge. In your first Charge on the other hand, where you also speak of Unity, there are half a dozen sentences on which I would crave your permission to offer some remarks. For they give a brief, summary expression to an opinion which is very dominant in these days, but which I cannot hold to be other than erroneous, and which,

whenever it has been allowed to display itself in action, has been hurtful to all true living Unity.

In the latter part of that Charge, having spoken of the manner in which the Annual Meetings of the Clergy at Visitations may serve to produce uniformity in our practice, you proceed thus: "I am prepared to hear it said that uniformity without unity is a hollow and lifeless thing. This is granted as soon as said. But will not a thoughtful, much more a philosophical mind detect something trivial and unmeaning in this rhetorical way of opposing unity and uniformity, as if they were two ideas, almost two repugnant things, instead of the outward and inward, the visible and invisible form of one and the same reality? But even though they were things separable, uniformity even without unity is at least better than discrepancy added to disunion. If we were indeed so shorn of the spirit of grace as to lack inward unity among ourselves, still there is no reason why we should inflict the visible tokens of our disunion upon the flocks committed to our charge. But after all, is it not certain that uniformity is the silent and symbolical language of unity? Is there any law in God's works, which has not its own invariable form? What is the variety of nature but the uniform expression of a variety of laws, not a various expression of any one law? Do not laws of relation, and proportion, and symmetrical figure pervade all the works of God with a severe and unerring uniformity? It is absolutely certain that, wheresoever there is unity in the idea, there will also be uniformity in the expression; and in all things which have life, the converse is also true. Dissolution of parts will break up the uniformity of organized bodies; but it is only after the

life is fled. It will linger a while in testimony of what it was, and then dissolve into multitude and variety. But there is no such thing as unity of life without a uniformity of structure and a harmony of operations: and in all moral action uniformity of practice is not only a symbol but a means to unity of will."

Now in the first place I would beg you to consider, why is it "trivial and unmeaning" to speak of Unity and Uniformity as two totally distinct and separate ideas, seeing that people are so prone to confound them, and that such evils have resulted from the confusion. Of course, if the opposition be merely "rhetorical," it may then be trivial and unmeaning. But even if uniformity were the only outward expression in which unity can manifest itself, still it is not necessarily trivial and unmeaning to urge men to meditate on the distinction between the form and the spirit; since our idolatrous fancy and understanding are so apt to mix and mistake them, and to cleave in all things mainly, if not solely, to that which is outward. Hence those persons in all ages, who have lifted up their voices against the superstitious observance of the letter which killeth, and have called men to the reasonable worship of the lifegiving spirit, are rightly honoured among the benefactors of mankind. Nay, did not our Divine Master Himself reprove those who were scrupulous in tithing mint and anise and cummin, while they neglected judgement and mercy and faith? those who made clean the outside of the cup and platter, but within were full of ravening and wickedness? At the same time I readily allow that the antiformalists also often run into excess, forgetting that, though the empty cup is sorry refreshment, the wine without the cup would

be spilt abroad, — forgetting that, in this our state of imperfect selfcontroll, forms and ordinances imposed from without are wholesome and necessary, and that it is a higher act of freedom to submit to them than to reject them. They are too apt to fall short—who indeed does not?—of that heavenly Wisdom, which taught, *These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone.*

But further, I would contend that uniformity, in the sense which in these days is usually attacht to that word, is by no means necessarily or essentially the form in which unity manifests itself; that, on the contrary, the injudicious pursuit and enforcement of uniformity have oftentimes marred unity, and must do so, from engaging in an endless struggle to efface and destroy that diversity and variety, which God has ordained shall prevail in every part of the creation. This desire of imposing uniformity is one of the commonest errours of our weak, self-relying, narrowhearted, stiffminded nature. For it is not a desire of raising ourselves and our brethren up to some ideal standard. He who could frame such a conception, would likewise discern that the only way of approximating to its accomplishment is by animating men with the same principles, and stirring them to realize those principles, as best they may, according to the gifts they have received. Nor will the seeker after uniformity be studious to conform his own conduct to that of his neighbours. Such an attempt would indeed imply an amiable humility: but it would be impracticable, since, while shaping ourselves after the model of one, we should be receding from thousands; and it would often involve a sacrifice of honest convictions. They however who want the whole world to walk in one way, are sure to

mean at bottom that this way shall be their own way. The one exemplary unit, to which men have wisht that all others should conform, has always been more or less that which occupies the largest space in our intellectual field of vision, and with the notions and feelings, the habits and circumstances of which we are the most familiar. Indeed, inasmuch as it is a point of duty to take care that what we do shall be that which our deliberate judgement deems best and fittest, a slight logical oversight will infer that the selfsame course must be best and fittest for others; although differences of position, of relations, of education, of character, of moral and intellectual habits, give rise to endless varieties in that which is obligatory and expedient.

Delusions of this kind have been a perpetual source of misconceptions, misjudgement, contemptuous and hostile feelings, and even of overt enmity, in every region in which man has had to act: but they have been far the most hurtful in the Church; because in questions pertaining to religion we too readily identify our will with God's will, and thus, instead of being checkt by that deference for others which practical life breeds, grow to fancy ourselves bound to carry our will into effect; and because all constraint from without is injurious to that, which can have no true worth, except as the free and reasonable service of the heart and mind. In the very first age of the Church obstinate attempts were made to enforce rites and ordinances, which were outward, typical, unessential, and therefore finite, mutable, and transitory. Nay, the purpose of the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, which in this as in other respects differed so widely from other Councils, was to put an end to dissension by sanctioning

diversity of practice: and though two positive regulations were enacted, as expedient under the circumstances of the Church at Jerusalem, it was soon felt that these regulations also were merely local and temporary; wherefore the Church, in a wise exercise of her liberty, thought right to remit them. St Paul too had to struggle over and over against one form or other of this delusion; and hence it is in his writings that we best learn what are the true principles of unity, and how to discriminate them from those rules of uniformity, which men are ever setting up in their stead. The former, it has often been recognized, are proclaimed for all ages of the Church in those sublime verses of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which are the text of this Sermon: and those verses are followed by an enumeration of the different gifts and offices bestowed on the various members of Christ's body, which are to *work effectually* in union, so that *the whole body shall be joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth*. Again, what a lesson full of heavenly wisdom does he give to the Church in the fourteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans! a lesson which the Church has grievously disregarded, and against which she has frequently sinned; nay, which has been shamefully evaded by persons bearing rule in the Church, under the plea that it related merely to those early ages, when Christians were living in the midst of a heathen world; as if the principles urged through that whole chapter were not of lasting obligation; as if its precepts were anything else than a setting forth of that gentleness and forbearance and love, which ought to guide the disciples of Christ in all their dealings with each other, so that no one may destroy or hurt any of those *for whom Christ died*. Or

shall we rather open the first Epistle to the Corinthians, in order to learn how there are *diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit*, and *differences of administrations, but the same Lord*, and *diversities of operations, but the same God working all in all?* and how it is the will of God that *the body should not be one member, but many*, each performing its part in ministering to the body, and to every other member of it? and how a far higher wisdom is manifested in the union of all these diverse members into one body, than *if the body were all one member?* I know not what words could prove more convincingly than this whole passage, that uniformity is not the essential form of unity, but that unity, according to the riches and fulness which God has been pleased to shew forth in His world, manifests itself best in diversity.

Here I cannot help asking you whether there is not something slightly "rhetorical" in your own antithesis, that "uniformity even without unity is at least better than discrepancy added to disunion." For, since the persons who fall under your reproof draw a broad distinction between unity and uniformity, so as even to "oppose" them to each other, it seems plain they cannot be advocating "discrepancy added to disunion," but must rather be maintaining the very truth urged by St Paul, that unity manifests itself in diversity. And as they set the two ideas of unity and uniformity in opposition, they must probably contend, — with much truth, though, it may be, with some exaggeration, — that, according to the laws of nature, of man's moral nature, as well as that of the outward world, a real living mighty unity cannot manifest itself otherwise than in diversity. This proposition would seem indeed to be directly opposed

to yours, that "uniformity is the silent and symbolical language of unity;" and still more to that implied in the question which follows: "What is the variety of nature but the uniform expression of a variety of laws, not a various expression of any one law?" But as the word *uniformity*, like every other abstract term which gets into general circulation, has become somewhat ambiguous, it is possible that some part of the apparent contradiction may arise out of this ambiguity. In our popular speech, I conceive, *uniformity* means identity in outward form or act, more especially when used with reference to the Church and its services, being generally associated with the Act of Uniformity, by which that identity was enjoined; and we use the term equally, whether the outward identity result from an identity of inward principles, or be imposed compulsorily by some external power. This however is very different from Hooker's meaning, when he says (E. P. iii. 1. 3), "The Unity of the Church of Christ consisteth in that Uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have, by reason of that one Lord whose servants they all profess themselves, that one Faith which they all acknowledge, that one Baptism wherewith they are all initiated." For this uniformity of the members of Christ means their being actuated by the same formative principles, and is perfectly compatible, as Hooker contends throughout his great work, with wide diversities of civil, moral, and religious acts. Hence that which is said in behalf of uniformity in Hooker's sense of the word, is no argument in favour of that very different uniformity which has been imposed on us by the Acts of our Legislature. Both may be good; but as logicians, in arguing for the latter, we must beware of using

arguments which apply solely to the former. Yet the chief part of your arguments, so far as I can understand them, seem to relate rather to the mode of operation, than to the result produced thereby. Therefore, when you say that "the variety of nature is the uniform expression of a variety of laws," the opponent of Uniformity might rejoin, *This is all I wish: let the infinite variety of human thoughts and feelings and characters find their uniform appropriate utterance in the same manner, each after its kind.* But the result of such a process, however harmonious it might be, whatever Unity there might be in it, would have nothing of the Uniformity which he condemns.

Still I must confess myself perplext by the assertion, which, though not directly enunciated, is implied in your interrogation, that "the variety of nature is the uniform expression of a variety of laws, not a various expression of any one law." Surely the aim of Philosophy and Science is, and has ever been more or less consciously, to trace up those secondary laws of nature, which they discern in their immediate operation, to their one aboriginal source: they have rightly felt the conviction that this source must be one; and though they have often overreacht themselves in the pursuit, they have made great progress therein. According to the doctrines both of Philosophy and Science, as it seems to me, the variety of nature is the varied expression of a few simple laws, diversified by the character and combination of the elements subjected to their operation. As in speech, by a few simple laws, out of a few vocal elements variously combined, we produce an almost endless variety of words, so does Nature, out of a few elements, by a few simple laws, produce an endless variety of forms

and appearances. You maintain indeed that "it is absolutely certain that, wheresoever there is unity in the idea, there will also be uniformity in the expression." If however by *uniformity* you here mean sameness, I would remind you of the common remark that no two leaves on an oak are exactly alike. In the lower orders of the creation a considerable uniformity is found, in earths, in crystals; but the higher we mount, the more it gives place to diversity. The same distinction too prevails between the different classes of the same order: firs for instance are more monotonous than deciduous trees. Moreover in all classes those species, which are affected by cultivation, acquire a greater number of varieties, to which there hardly seems to be a limit; the recent improvements in horticulture having shewn that in the seeds of the commonest flower an almost indefinite variability is latent, which cultivation may develope. A like law is discoverable in mankind. As man stands above the rest of the creation, there are far greater diversities of character in him, even in his rudest state, than in any other creature: in proportion as his intellectual and moral faculties are educed by cultivation, the varieties of individual character become more markt: and as you yourself have well said, in your Sermon *On the Mind of Christ*, when characters become perfected by putting on that mind, "they stand out with an individuality as definite and perfect as the stars of heaven."

So again in the works of the human intellect, in proportion as it is more genial, more vigorous, more refined, there will be a greater variety; while here also, when genius is extinct, when imagination is feeble, the understanding comes forward with its rules of uniformity

You are not old enough to remember the contest against the unities, as they were misnamed, and the other uniformities, which exercised such sway in literature during the last century, and which had just been driven to their last hold at the time when I began to take interest in such questions. The illustration however may be of use: for here also it was maintained that uniformity is indispensable to unity; and the French tragic writers, belonging to a nation which has a singular faculty of degrading ideas into abstractions, deemed that in writing tragedies they must adopt the outward formal rules, which peculiar circumstances, connected with the origin of the Greek drama, imposed upon the tragedians of Athens. But Lessing, and other critics since, have shewn that this very seeking after uniformity was most inimical to unity,—that, if the great Greek poets had lived in modern Europe, the form of their compositions would have been very different,—and that there is far more real unity between the tragedies of Shakspeare and the Greek, notwithstanding the glaring dissimilarity in their outward form. Here I may remark that, as Christianity has enabled man to gain a much clearer sight of the Unity which pervades all things, Shakspeare's wonderful genius, living under the influences of Christian thought, has fused elements into unity, which the Greeks would have deemed discordant. Yet the unity in him is of a deeper and higher kind. So is the unity of Christian painting deeper and higher than that of Greek sculpture; and the unity of Christian harmony than that of Greek melody; even as the unity in the varied song of the nightingale is far more perfect than in the monotonous cry of the cuckoo; which, in spite of its uniformity, can

never blend into unity. Or, to take another familiar example, there is nothing in which the dreary dulness of the last century manifests itself more than in its town-architecture, which has but one remarkable characteristic, its uniformity. This they sought; and this they attained. You may walk for miles in London, hedged in between two similar and parallel lines of straight, high, dingy brick walls, unbroken except by regular rows of oblong holes. Yet these streets never give a conception of unity comparable to that awakened by Venice and Nuremberg and the old parts of Antwerp and Bruges. On the other hand few intelligent persons will doubt which town in England does produce the grandest impression of unity, with the rich variety of its buildings, speaking of so many centuries, but harmonized by the unity of their moral and spiritual purpose, and bearing witness that generation after generation rejoiced in consecrating their choicest gifts to bring up the youth of England in the pursuit of truth and in the knowledge of God. Nay, what is that most perfect pattern of Unity, which God has vouchsafed to establish upon earth for the comfort and blessing of mankind, and which is declared to be a type of the Unity between the Church and her Lord? It is not the union between man and man. In order that the unity may be more entire, the diversity must be greater: that which is lacking to the one, must be supplied by the other. And even among marriages those may be deemed the most perfect, not where there is the fullest uniformity and similarity, but the most harmonious contrast of characters, where each is the complement, so to say, to the other, each being according to its kind. A masculine character in the wife, an effeminate one in the

husband, may increase uniformity, but will hardly improve unity. Wordsworth, when speaking of the causes of the pleasure derived from metre, is led into a like train of illustrations. "Among the chief of these causes," he says, "is to be reckoned a principle which must be well known to those who have made any of the arts the object of accurate reflexion; I mean the pleasure which the mind derives from the perception of similitude in dissimilitude. This principle is the great spring of the activity of our minds, and their chief feeder. From this principle the direction of the sexual appetite, and all the passions connected with it, take their origin: it is the life of our ordinary conversation; and upon the accuracy with which similitude in dissimilitude, and dissimilitude in similitude are perceived, depend our taste and our moral feelings."

I have only been repeating again and again what St Paul says about the unity of the body. If a body were to be made up of arms, or of legs, or of heads, or of any one member whatsoever, how inferior would it be in unity to the human form divine! and how greatly is the unity of that form raised above that of quadrupeds by the distinction between the arms and the legs! Yet, simple as these truths are, and plainly as they are involved in that passage of St Paul, they are entirely lost sight of by those who hunger and thirst after uniformity. You yourself too, if you had borne them in mind, would hardly have written so strongly in favour of it. Nor is that which is true of individual life less true of corporate life; though in this instance also it is a truth that few statesmen are duly convinced of. For practical men, when not content with being mere practical men, but ambitious of reasoning about the work they are engaged in, will generally measure all things

by the last of their understanding, the faculty which practical life developes the most; while it rather stunts the imagination, which might have helpt them to conceive the manifold benefits accruing from diversities of circumstances, of customs and manners, of ancestral institutions and feelings. Hence it comes that our political reformers are so busy in squaring and leveling all things according to some favorite rule. Their axiom is much the same as yours, that the unity of the nation is to manifest itself in the uniformity of all its parts. This was the axiom of the jacobinical republicans; and this was the axiom of the jacobinical emperor. Few men in the last generation, and not many in this, could appreciate the truth, which Niebuhr, from his living insight into all history, discerned with such clearness, that it became one of the ruling principles of his thoughts, — the truth which he has exprest repeatedly, and which lies at the bottom of a large part of his political reflexions,—that, "as in organic beings the most perfect life is that which animates the greatest variety of members, so among states that is the most perfect, in which a number of institutions originally distinct, being organized each after its kind into centres of national life, form a complex whole." With this truth we Englishmen ought to be familiar; since our own constitution a few years back was, and perhaps still is, the noblest exemplification of it: yet many of the recent innovations in our legislation shew that we have no adequate conception of its importance. Rather are we infected with the desire of centralizing and uniforming everything. We are so intoxicated with the love of machinery, that we think mechanical action better than moral, as being surer and more punctual in its operation

And so indeed it is immediately: but we forget that one of the noblest features in the English character has arisen in great measure from that diversity of local institutions, which have awakened a higher feeling of personal responsibility than is to be found in other nations. To the meditative minds of Germany on the other hand, such thoughts have become matter of ordinary contemplation. Thus, when looking the other day over the last edition of Nitzsches *System of Christian Doctrine*, a book which is quite a digest of profound thought and learning, and one of the most precious works of recent German theology, I came to the following sentence in a newly added note, occasioned by Rothe's Treatise on the Church: "Every one will acknowledge without hesitation, that the highest unity, the most perfect catholicity, is that which comprehends, combines, and reconciles the utmost fulness of diversities." He then complains that Rothe, while he assigns all the riches of variety to the Christian State, makes the Church "a present of the shadowy grandeur, but real poverty, of uniformity:" which doubtless is among the reasons why Rothe's book has found so much acceptance in England, not indeed for his political, but for his ecclesiastical views.

Nitzsch further asks, "How is the idea of unity and universality best realized, by the voyage of the Romish Liturgy to Siam and Pekin, or by the working together of the evangelical missions in all quarters of the world?" This question reminds me of that dismal substitution of uniformity for unity, under which the heart and mind of man groaned and pined, when the Papacy, incapacitated by its very position, and the assumptions involved therein, for recognizing any other than a formal

unity, imposed a Liturgy in a dead language on all Christian congregations, of every nation and region beneath its sway, issuing its despotical edict to arrest the miracle of Pentecost, and ordaining, so far as lay in its power, that men should not hear and speak of the wonderful works of God in their own tongues, being unable to appreciate the heavenly glory of that unity, when the great multitude, *of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues*, shall stand before the throne of the Lamb. It is a painful symptom, that such an abuse should find admirers among the members of our Church in these days. They plead that it is an advantage for foreiners, when they go into a church in any country, to hear the same words with which they have been familiar from their childhood. So too forsooth many a foreiner has thought it very inconvenient that he could not hear his own language spoken at inns, in the marketplace, by the peasants when he is roaming about the country, in society when he wishes to mix in it; and he has seldom thought of asking himself whether, of the two, it would not be more reasonable that Mahomet should go to the mountain. Thus, for the sake of a few casual vagrants, the natives of every country are to be under the soul-deadening bondage of hearing words in an unknown language, and of repeating the same by rote, at the very time when the depths of their being ought to be stirred. They are to be debarred from the blessing of having their own homely words, the words which sprang up within them along with their thoughts and feelings, sanctified by being made the means of pouring forth their hearts before God. Is it not written, *Let the children first be filled?* And who can estimate the grandeur, the depth, the expansive power, which our language and the German have derived

from the national liturgical offices, as well as from the national translation of the Scriptures? What a difference is there between the very word, *word*, and *mot!* how far purer, less sensual, more spiritual are *love* and *liebe* than *amour* and *amore!* which is doubtless owing mainly to the scriptural use of those words. To a feeble imagination indeed, especially when its wings have been clipt that it may not fly beyond the purlieus of self, it will seem a grand and imposing thought, that all the nations of the earth should be uttering the selfsame words to God. But is there nothing grand and elevating in the thought, that all nations are lifting up their voices to Him, each using its own words, the words which gush from the depths of its heart, and which are fresh with the dew of its feelings? Is there nothing grand in the thought, that "Earth with her thousand voices praises God?" Verily shoals of men, if they spoke their mind, would declare that Thomas Burnet's smooth flat paradisiacal earth, as smooth and flat as the sea-sand, would be far more beautiful than the present confused jumble of mountain and valley and rock and cliff and glen. And certainly the sea-sand has the advantage on the side of uniformity; yet, unless one bring in other objects to limit it, one cannot raise it up into the idea of unity: so essential to unity is diversity. Or again what visible object can kindle the idea of unity with anything like the same power as the sight of the nightly sky, with its hosts of stars and constellations showered over it in every variety of form? Yet doubtless the uniformalist would deplore that they are not ranged in regular courses, in rows or concentric circles, like the spangles on his drawingroom ceiling. He would say, *Yes, the sky would be very beautiful, if I might but comb out its tresses, and put its jewels in order.*

I have written to you freely, discursively, in the tone of a private letter, rather than of an argumentative discussion. For I had it on my heart to speak on this matter of uniformity, which is again much talkt of now, as is natural when an age takes a bent toward the externals of religious worship: it often comes before us in the discharge of our official duties: and unless much caution be exercised by those who are in authority, it seems likely to aggravate the divisions in the Church. Hence this passage in your Charge has been quoted and praised oftener, I believe, than any other, a fate which not seldom befalls the worst passage in a book. For if a wise man says anything which countenances and seems to give a reason for a popular errour, the holders of that errour are glad to shelter themselves under the sanction of his authority, and of whatever show of argument he may bring forward in their behalf. And though you yourself, while you advocate uniformity, are animated with a true and fervent love of unity, and would never seek uniformity by any measure calculated to impair unity, yet in the generality of cases I seem to have observed, that the most clamorous and pertinacious sticklers for uniformity are those into whose hearts the desire of unity has hardly gained an entrance, and whose religion vents itself for the most part in outward observances. Indeed how could it well be otherwise? They who have seen the blessed vision of Unity, with the prayer of the Saviour breathing through it as the spirit of its life, and the smile of the Father beaming upon it, how can they turn from this, to dote upon anything so shadowy, so harsh, so empty as mere Uniformity? or how can they care much about Uniformity, except so far as it is indeed

the expression of a living love for Unity, submitting its own heart and mind to do as others do for the sake of a more entire union and communion?

At the same time, seeing that one can scarcely combat any errour, without being suspected of intending to become the champion of its opposite, I must remark, that, while impugning the notion that uniformity is indispensable to unity, I have not meant to say a single word in behalf of irregularity and licentiousness. It was indeed very sad a year ago to see your pious and learned friend Dr Pusey urging differences of ritual practice as arguments against a measure designed to prepare the way, under God's blessing, for a closer communion between our Church and that of Prussia; for it has been constantly held by the highest authorities, that, in things ceremonial, great diversities may warrantably prevail between different Churches, and that these diversities should be no hindrance to communion between them. Within the pale of each national Church on the other hand it is expedient and desirable, for the sake of order and discipline, that there should be a considerable similarity of practice; and a national Liturgy is such an inestimable benefit in many ways, that, to secure it, we should readily sacrifice whatever might be gained by a more definite expression of personal and occasional feelings. What I deprecate is the endeavour to establish uniformity for its own sake, as if uniformity in itself were a thing to be sought and admired. So far as uniformity is expedient, it is expedient from our weakness and frailty, by reason of which we cannot be left to the free utterance of our own hearts and minds; and because the submission to certain general rules and restraints is a condition of social union:

moreover in divers parts of our work our power is much strengthened by our pulling together. This truth is urged with his usual judgment by him, who alone ought to have been termed the Chancellor of Human Nature, as well as the Chancellor of Nature,—whereas the former title has been given to a man far less deserving of it,—in his excellent little treatise *On the Pacification of the Church*, which, along with the other *On Church Controversies*, might be profitably studied by all parties in these days; being rich in practical wisdom suited to all ages, but of a kind which has seldom been duly heeded, and often grossly sinned against. I will quote the closing paragraph of the part which speaks concerning ceremonies, as the remarks, even in their literal sense, are unfortunately not wholly inapplicable to our own time. "For the cap and surplice, since they be things in their nature indifferent, and yet by some held superstitious, and that the question is between science and conscience, it seemeth to fall within the compass of the Apostle's rule, *that the stronger do descend and yield to the weaker*. It will be materially said, that the rule holdeth between private man and private man, but not between the conscience of a private man and the order of a Church. But yet, since the question at this time is of a toleration, not by connivence, which may encourage disobedience, but by law, which may give a liberty, it is good again to be advised whether it fall not within the equity of the former rule; the rather because the silencing of ministers by this occasion is, in this scarcity of good preachers, a punishment that lighteth upon the people, as well as upon the party. And for the subscription, it seemeth to me in the nature of a confession, and

therefore more proper to bind in the unity of faith, and to be urged rather for articles of doctrine, than for rites and ceremonies and points of outward government. For howsoever politic considerations and reasons of state may require uniformity, yet Christian and divine grounds look chiefly upon unity." Which last sentence, among other things, may convince you that the antithesis between uniformity and unity is not altogether trivial and unmeaning. At least Bacon was so impress with the need of enforcing the distinction, that in his Essay *On Unity in Religion* he again says, "They be two things, unity and uniformity," that is, two distinct things, which must not be confounded.

Yet, even where unity of spirit, and reverent obedience to the authority of the Church, and regard to the objects of social union, will produce uniformity of action, it is of no slight importance that we should well understand why we seek that uniformity, and why it is desirable. For in all action, if we are to do right consistently, we should act intelligently, knowing what is the ground of our acting, what is to be its end, and what its measure. Thus, if it be the duty of individual Christians to submit to the authority of the Church, for the sake of edification, both their own and that of their brethren, it becomes a correlative duty in those who legislate for the Church, and who exercise authority over it, not to press on its inferior members, not to burthen their consciences with that which is unnecessary, to deal tenderly with them, as loving parents deal with their children, yea, as the Lord Himself dealt with His disciples. They should keep in mind that excellent axiom, which Bacon quotes, and which sums up the argument of the foregoing pages,

"*Differentiae rituum commendant unitatem doctrinae*, the diversities of ceremonies do set forth the unity of doctrine." On the other hand, if it be supposed that uniformity is to be pursued for its own sake, as a thing desirable in itself, as the only outward form of unity, without which unity cannot exist, then it will be pursued at all costs, at all risks, in all things, small as well as great; and the end is, as has been seen so often in the history of the Church, of the English Church more especially, that Unity is blindly and recklessly sacrificed before the cold, empty idol Uniformity.

You indeed assert that there is a higher and weightier reason, which makes uniformity a main auxiliary in the development of the Christian life; for that "in all moral action uniformity of practice is not only a symbol but a means to unity of will." Alas, my friend! uniformity a means to unity! Is this the lesson we learn from the history of the English Church? Is this the effect which has been produced by our own Acts of Uniformity? those strange, anomalous Acts, which in their imperious character are almost peculiar to our Church, and which resulted from her singular position, when she found herself in a manner identified with the government of the State, and enabled to wield the authority of the State in girding herself round with penal enactments. Was it not the Act of Uniformity under Queen Elizabeth, that first gave birth to the Nonconformists, as a distinct, powerful, and formidable body within the pale of our Church, gathering all those varieties of feeling and opinion, which could not reconcile themselves to its requisitions, into one mass, and setting the Conformists and the Nonconformists in definite array against

each other? Many pleas may indeed be urged in excuse of the statesmen and churchmen by whom that Act was framed. The very existence of the government seemed bound up with the unity and vigour of the Reformed Church. The fallacy of that delusion, which holds unity to be inseparable from uniformity, had not then been so thoroughly exposed, as it has since been, by the teaching of philosophy, and the still more cogent lessons of history. The sanctity of man's individual conscience had never been rightly appreciated by the secular wisdom of Rome; which then, as ever, sought mainly for outward submission, and which practically sanctioned, if it did not encourage, the notion, that men might justifiably profess many things by their words and their acts, to which they found nothing answerable, and much repugnant, in their hearts and minds. For this is one of the miserable curses attacht to those who worship the idol Uniformity, that, as their aim is bent upon the form, rather than the power, of Unity, they grow to care little about the substance, provided they can get the shadow; and thus they become little scrupulous about truth, in others, and ultimately in themselves also. Nor had men learnt as yet to estimate the consequences of that epochal act in the history of the world, when by God's gracious ordinance the leaders of the Reformation put the Bible into the hands of their countrymen in their own tongue. They saw not what a mighty step this was toward the completion of the work begun on the first day of Pentecost, how a voice was now issuing over the earth proclaiming to each individual man, that he had a reason and a conscience, and that the Eternal God had vouchsafed to make known His mysterious counsels even to him, so that he was no

longer to receive certain portions of the word of life doled out to him by others, but was to read the whole himself, to study it, to meditate upon it, to speak of it to his family, and among his friends. Few saw either the blessedness of the power which was thus imparted to mankind, or the dangers to which, like all power, when abused, it might be perverted. In such a state of things it is not to be wondered at that the sagacious statesmen and churchmen who had the most influence in the Queen's councils at the outset of her reign, or that the Queen herself,—while they were rightly persuaded that the national religion ought to be one, not only in spirit and doctrine, but to a certain extent in form also,—should have drawn their cords somewhat too tight with regard to the latter. Indeed, though more latitude might have been left open on certain subjects, which were matter of contention, the engagement that her ministers shall make use of her appointed Liturgy seems to be no more than every Church is fully entitled to demand. Moreover, bound as the Queen was to feel, and to shew that she felt, herself to be the sovereign of her whole people, it became her duty, as well as her policy, not to offend that large body in the nation who still held to the authority of Rome, by departing more than was necessary from the ancient ritual and discipline. Nor does there appear to have been reason at the time for apprehending that the Act would find much opposition in any other direction. Still, although this Act would seem thus far to be nearly unobjectionable,—I am not speaking of its penalties, or of its provision for compelling attendance at church,—we may learn from its effects what a perilous career they enter upon, who deem

themselves called to enforce uniformity as a means to unity. It is one of the saddest spectacles in the history of the world, a spectacle at which angels may have wept, to see the unity of our Church shaken, her peace broken up for a whole century,—to see faithful, holy, zealous men, holding the same faith, acknowledging the same Lord, baptized by the same Spirit, earnestly desiring to serve and approach the same Eternal Father, divided for generations, and even stirred into fierce hostility against each other, by differences about a vestment or a posture. These were not indeed the sole grounds of disagreement; but these, and such as these, were the chief grounds of contention: and had these been removed, as they easily might have been, if a few more points had been left to the discretion of the minister, according to plans brought forward several times in the course of this and the following century, the breaches on matters of greater importance would have been healed, with God's blessing, by a spirit which manifested such a desire for unity, and which would have been strengthened by the might of our Lord's prayer that His disciples might partake in the perfect Unity of the Godhead. You will say perhaps,—at least other persons less mild and considerate have said, and still say,—that the men who scrupled about such things ought to have yielded their scruples to the authority of the Church. Most true, my friend! they ought; and the best of them probably would have done so, if they could have lookt at the matter with the philosophic calmness, which at the interval of two or three centuries costs so little effort. But these men were full of the recollections of the darkness and bondage out of which they had been delivered; the fears of its recurrence were not idle

fancies; they felt they had a warfare to wage; and whatever seemed identified with the errours, by which the blessed truth and power of the Gospel had so long been obscured, was an abomination in their eyes. Even without these extraordinary circumstances, if we reflect on the almost irresistible power which inveterate associations of one sort or other exercise over every child of man, we shall not deem ourselves warranted in blaming our neighbours, because on certain points their associations are not so pliant as our own. These are the very cases, of which St Paul speaks: *One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike.* What then? Does the Apostle, as any man would nowadays, pronounce one of these to be wrong, and the other right? does he bid them submit their opinions to the authority of the Church, and charge the Church to settle the difference, in order that uniformity may be upheld? What a divine sanction do his words give to the sacred liberty of conscience! *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* Besides, the duty of those who are under authority, to obey their rulers, involves a correlative duty on the part of those who exercise authority, not to exact obedience further than is needful for the safety and well-being of the community. Indeed all governments have had a feeling of this truth; and this is one reason why laws are mainly negative, repressing that which is evil and noxious, and leaving it to powers which speak more home to the heart and conscience, to enjoin what ought to be done. Above all should this maxim regulate the conduct of such as exercise an authority derived from Him, who would not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax.

Thus it is in the history of the English Church from 1560 to 1662, that we are to trace the effects of the first grand experiment to employ uniformity as a means to unity. I call it the first, because, though Procrustes is renowned as an ardent uncompromising lover of uniformity, it is not recorded that he aimed at fostering unity thereby: and that which was wholesome in the Spartan constitution, and other like institutions, was not the uniformity, which was deadening, but the severe physical and moral training: nor was the purpose to promote unity, in which it would have signally failed, but strength, by subjecting the whole nation to the strict discipline of an army. For thus far uniformity is indeed beneficial, and almost indispensable, so far as men are to be dealt with as machines, whether in a manufactory, or on a field of battle. But the framers of our first Act of Uniformity did desire and propose to themselves to unite the whole nation, so far as they could,—at least all that part of it which had embraced the doctrines of the Reformation,—in one religion under the supremacy of the Queen. Nor had they cause to anticipate the strong opposition which they were about to excite: whereby personally they stand exculpated. This however only shews the more convincingly how the attempt to enforce uniformity will of itself provoke division, calling out differences, which would else have subsisted amicably side by side, into definite, contentious opposition. Several of our wiser prelates indeed, when they discovered the unforeseen result, did what they could by their mildness and forbearance to allay the disputes: but their success at best could not be more than partial, so long as the Act itself continued a permanent symbol of separation. Nor was the Act allowed to slumber: it

led to prosecutions, to penalties: and ever and anon an utterance of royal will commanded that the nation must be uniform, and must be united; as when Queen Elizabeth wrote to Archbishop Parker, that she was "certainly determined to have all such diversities, varieties, and novelties, amongst them of the clergy and her people, as bred nothing but contention, offense, and breach of common charity, and were also against the laws, good usages, and ordinances of her realm, reformed and represt, and brought to one manner of uniformity through her whole realm and dominion;" or as when James the First at the Hampton Court Conference silenced his opponent by the clenching argument, "I will have one doctrine and one discipline, one religion in substance and in ceremony; and therefore I charge you never to speak more to that point,—how far you are bound to obey,—when the Church hath ordained it." The Queen must have known how hard it was to keep her frill, however stiffly starcht, smooth and in order for a single day: the King had ample experience of the impossibility of curbing his own words and thoughts in regard to the merest trifles: and yet they audaciously fancied they could drill every subject in their dominions into putting the same uniform on his heart and mind. Thus indulgence failed to heal the dissensions, because the ground of them could not be taken away: severity on the other hand widened and embittered them. At such a crisis two courses lie open. The chief causes of difference might have been removed: this was the course recommended by the wisdom of Bacon, and accorded with the spirit which animated the wisest and best men of the age, from Grindal down to Ussher. But the σχολαστικὸς, from whom we learnt so many sapient lessons in our boyhood,

when he had been promoted to be a schoolmaster, was heard to say, *I have been flogging my boys assiduously every day the last year: yet they have not learnt anything: I must flog them twice a day next year.* This happy unconsciousness that there is any other element in teaching, beside the use of the rod, may have been peculiar to our old companion: but the process of reasoning, that, when a certain degree of severity has aggravated an evil, the severity must be redoubled to remove it, is common among all classes of men, nor least so among those who meddle in statecraft; notwithstanding the lesson taught them by the history of Rehoboam, who lost the ten tribes by this very policy, a lesson confirmed by manifold subsequent experience. Such notions were very prevalent, when God was pleased to hasten the judgement on our Church by placing Archbishop Laud at the head of it. This prelate is the favorite hero and saint of the worshipers of uniformity; and not without a good claim to their admiration. It was said of old, that *love fulfilleth the law;* but his doctrine was, that, if you make people keep the letter of the law, they will gain love. There is something marvellous in the pertinacity with which he ever clings to the conviction, that, if the outside of the platter be cleansed, all will be right. When he was chosen Chancellor of your University, his great anxiety, evinced by reiterated earnest remonstrances, is about *formalities*, that is to say, the academical dress: he complains that *formalities*, "which are in a sort the outward and visible face of the University, are in a manner utterly decayed," and says, "If this go on, the University will lose ground every day both at home and abroad:" he charges the Heads to take care that the members of the University should "fit themselves with

formalities fitting their degrees, that the University may have credit by looking like itself; *and then I doubt not but it will be itself too. For it will not endure but to be as it seems.*" These last words, which sum up the creed of the uniformalists, are a curious mark of the outwardliness and superficiality of Laud's mind, — in his heart there was better stuff; — which same character is betrayed by the whole tenour of his most meagre Diary, by the dreary triviality and dearth of imagination in his dreams, and by many sad testimonies in his conduct as a ruler of the Church. For how else can we conceive that an honest, conscientious man, appointed to discharge the office of a bishop in the Church of God, should never, as it would seem, have been disturbed by the thought, that it behoved him to dwell in his Diocese, stirring up the hearts of its clergy and other members by doctrine, by exhortation, by pastoral advice, strengthening the feeble, encouraging the irresolute, cheering the timid and desponding, and guiding those who needed counsel? that, though he was bishop of St David's for four years and a half, he only visited his Diocese twice during that period, for about two months each time, at a quadriennial Visitation? that, though he was Bishop of Bath and Wells for near two years, he never set foot in his Diocese? And what was he doing all the while? Doubtless, having tried to put the *formalities* right by his Articles at his Visitation, he trusted that everything would go right, and so thought he might employ himself in more important business as a hanger-on at Whitehall and Buckingham House. Alas, my friend, that such a man should have been selected by our modern uniformalists and ecclesiolaters, as the pattern of a churchman and a saint! a man who, when he had carried his point of

making Bishop Juxon Lord High Treasurer, wrote down in his Journal, "*And now, if the Church will not hold up themselves under God, I can do no more.*" I hardly know what words could have betrayed a grosser, shallower ignorance of what the Church is, and wherein her power lies; as though this were the true mode of promoting the increase of that Kingdom, which has been declared to be not of this world; as though one word of faith, one deed of love, one silent prayer were not far mightier to strengthen the Church, than all the Lord-Treasurerships of all the treasures that Mammon has ever piled up in any quarter of the globe. When such a man, — I speak not of his conduct at his trial and death; that was truly heroic and saintly; but, though his end would otherwise lead us to overlook the faults of his previous life, it must not do so when that life itself is held up as a pattern for our age to learn the art of governing the Church; — when such a man was bent to establish his views of uniformity, as the means of regenerating the Church, it cannot surprise a person, who knows anything of the strong and fervid spirits he had to contend with, that, instead of raising the condition of the Church, he overthrew it, falling himself first, with a fortitude and meekness worthy of a high place in the army of martyrs.

The Church was overthrown; and her fall was hastened, to say the least, by the stubborn policy of her Primate; as it was mainly occasioned from the first by her narrow-minded love of uniformity. As one proof how the very attempt to compress men's minds makes them fly asunder in all directions, I will cite a few words from Sanderson's Visitation Sermon in 1641: "I cannot dissemble my fear that it is but too true, by the proportion of

what we almost daily hear, or see, that, within little more than this one twelvemonth last past, there have been more false and superstitious doctrines vented in the pulpits and presses of England, than have been, in so open and daring a manner, in the whole space of almost fourscore years before, I mean since the first of Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory." This was the immediate effect of the futile attempt to repress such opinions by force. In order that the firy spirits thus kindled should burn themselves out, the Monarchy and the Church of England were swept away; and a free licence and scope were granted to all manner of opinions by Cromwell. Hereby men were taught "to feel the weight of too much liberty," and to long for what they had lost, for the ancient Government, for the Liturgy, for the Church. At the same time the King's Declaration of October 1660, one of the wisest state-papers ever issued, laid down principles, which, if they had been acted upon in a candid, conscientious, peace-loving spirit, would have done much for the pacification of our Church, and would have raised it to a power and dignity and efficiency far beyond what it ever has, or seems ever likely to attain. A strange voice past through England, a voice which spake of unity; but it was soon stifled by the tumultuous cries of opposite parties clamouring in rivalry for uniformity. And ere long all hope was blasted by that second, most disastrous, most tyrannical and schismatical Act of Uniformity; the authors of which, it is plain, were not seeking unity, but division. With evident design its provisions were made so stringent, the declaration required by it was worded with such exactive precision, that it was scarcely possible for an honest Presbyterian to make it: here and there one, whose habits of

thought and temper had preserved him from strong opinions, might: but for the great body no alternative remained, except to belie their conscience, or to cut themselves off from the national Church: and one can hardly doubt that this must have been the purpose of the framers of the Act. The excuses which may be urged for the first Act, have no place here: and though it is often pleaded in palliation of political parties, that their measures have been taken under the exasperation of suffering and the intoxication of victory, this would be a sorry apology for the conduct of an ecclesiastical government. No question could now be entertained about the prevalence and permanence of the scruples, which it was resolved to set at nought: they had been handed down for three generations, and had become more and more widely diffused, not among the rabble, but among men of exemplary holiness and zeal. Yet, with a full knowledge of all this, it was required that every minister, not only such as might be ordained thenceforward, but all who at that time had any benefice or promotion, should solemnly declare their "unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer." This was enjoined, it is stated, "to the end that uniformity in the public worship of God (which is so much desired) might be speedily effected." The previous canonical declaration, that the Prayerbook "contains nothing contrary to the word of God," was hardly more than was implied in the engagement to make use of the Prayerbook in public worship. But this strait waistcoat for men's consciences could scarcely have been devised except by persons themselves of seared consciences and hard hearts, by persons ready to gulp down

any oath, without scruple about more or less. Verily, when I think of that calamitous and unprincipled Act,—of the men by whom it was enacted, Charles the Second, and the Aristocracy and Gentry of his reign,—of the holy men against whom it was enacted,—it seems almost like a prologue to the profligacy and infidelity which followed closely upon it. But what were its direct effects with regard to the Unity of the Church? It bore the name of Uniformity on its forehead: can there have been any who persuaded themselves that a Uniformity so enforced could be a means to Unity? The only Unity that could have ensued from it would have been that of a dead level: and full of woe as have been the consequences of this Act in its failure, they would have been still more terrible had it succeeded. Therefore even we, who love and revere our national Church above every earthly institution, may bless God that it did not succeed. We may bless God, for that He has given such grace and power to weak, frail, human hearts, that meek and humble men, when strengthened by His Spirit, are not to be driven out of the path in which their conscience commands them to walk, by the leagued forces of King and Parliament and Convocation, by the severest penal enactments, or even by the bitter pang of having to leave their loved flocks. Yes, my friend, we may join in giving God thanks for the work He has wrought in such men,—for they are the true salt of the earth,—even though we may deem that there was much of errour in their judgements and opinions, almost as much as in our own. Yet how grievous was the wound to the Church at the time! how grievous is it still at this day in its enduring effects! Some two thousand ministers, comprising the chief part, it seems scarcely

questionable, of the most faithful and zealous in the land, were silenced in one day, were severed in one day from their flocks, were cast in one day out of our Church, for the sake of maintaining Uniformity. On that our English Bartholomew's day, the eye wandered over England, and in every fifth parish saw the people scattered abroad as sheep that had no shepherd. From that day do we date the origin of that constituted dissent and schism, which is the peculiar opprobrium and calamity of our Church, by which in almost every parish we find ourselves grievously crippled in our efforts to build up our people into a holy temple acceptable to the Lord; and which in this very year, by its frantic uprore, is rendering it impossible for our Legislature to take any efficient step toward the moral and religious education of the people, although the disclosure of the frightful condition of huge masses of our population seemed for a moment to have allayed the contentions of political parties. So terribly is the sin of our forefathers, who framed the Act of Uniformity, visited upon England at this day; nor can any human foresight discern either how or when these evils are likely to terminate. Moreover, after that we had thus cast out so much faith and zeal and holiness, after that,—to use an expression which has been applied less appropriately to a later event of far minor importance,—we had in this manner almost cast out the doctrine of Christ crucified from the pale of our Church, we had to travel through a century of coldness and dreariness and barrenness, of Arminianism and Pelagianism, of Arianism and latent Socinianism,—all which were found compatible with outward uniformity, —before the spirit, which was then driven away, returned with anything like the same power. And the unhappy

descendants of those who were then cast out, they too have suffered wofully for the sins of their forefathers, who in the time of their prosperity had been no less blindly zealous in sacrificing faith and hope and love to the same all-beguiling idol, Uniformity. They have suffered in being severed from the unity of the Church and of the nation: they have suffered in that narrowmindedness, those prejudices and jealousies, which are the heirloom of all sectaries: above all, they have suffered in losing the most precious part of that sacred deposit of faith, which our Lord gave to be the riches and life of His Church unto the end of the world.

Such are the lessons taught by the history of our Church concerning the efficacy of Uniformity, when enforced as a means to Unity. Nor, it seems to me, would a thoughtful, much more a philosophical mind look for any other. For unity is spiritual, pertains to the spiritual part of man, his heart, his mind, his will. Even in lower things a unity formed by aggregation, or agglomeration, or colligation, is merely factitious, like the unity of a sandheap, or of a fagot. If branches are to form a unity, they must be organized into it by a central vital principle. In children we often see how deadening an education of formalities is; and hence does it come to pass that such a swarm of persons walk about the world, whose moral being has been stunted and almost crusht in their childhood. To such unhappy victims of uniformity, the imposition of uniformity will be tolerable, and may even seem desirable; as is wittily signified by the fabulist, when he makes the fox who has lost his tail so urgent in pressing his brethren to pass an Act of self-mutilating Uniformity. But in proportion as a man's intellectual and moral and spiritual being have

been cultivated jointly, in the same proportion, as I have already observed, with reference to a like remark of your own, will the true genuine individuality of his character be called forth: and though the best men will ever be ready to become all things to all, for the sake of saving some, they who are accustomed to walk in the light of principle must needs feel a repugnance to that which is merely formal, especially when particular forms are associated with inveterate corruptions and abuses. Are all such men to be debarred at once from the ministry of the Church, because they entertain conscientious scruples on certain points acknowledged to be indifferent? The Act of Uniformity says *Yes:* the spirit of true Catholic Christianity says, *No.* The Church that does so exclude them, maims herself, by forfeiting the services of numbers who would have served her faithfully: many of these, feeling an inward call to the ministry, which they cannot follow within the pale of the Church, join the ranks of schism: and while the Act of Uniformity thus casts out many of the best fish from the net, all the bad, all the careless, all the unscrupulous, all the unprincipled may abide in it unmolested. The age which enacted this rigid ecclesiastical uniformity, was addicted, as might be imagined, to the practice of uniformalizing all things. It tried to uniformalize men's heads by dressing them out in fullbottomed wigs. It tried to uniformalize trees by cutting them into regular shapes. It could not bear the free growth and luxuriance of nature. Yet even trees, if they have any life, disregard the Act of Uniformity, and branch forth according to their kinds, so that the shears have constant work to clip their excrescences; and none submit quietly except the dead.

What then is to be the symbol of the unity of a national

Church? On this head I feel sure of having your cordial concurrence; and to you, as to me, it cannot but be a satisfaction, that on this head we have the authority of that great teacher, whom we both admire and honour, and to whom we both thankfully acknowledge the deepest intellectual obligations. Coleridge, in his Notes on Baxter's Life of himself, which are rich in valuable remarks on ecclesiastical matters, speaks of a Liturgy as the only means whereby the unity of doctrine and worship requisite in a national Church can be effectually and beneficially secured. A Liturgy does this, because it is not an outward bond,—so far as it is turned into such, its beneficial operation is frustrated,—but because it addresses itself immediately to the heart and mind in the moments of their highest exaltation, and awakens and bears aloft the slumbering spirit,—because by means of it we are knit together into one body in the presence of God, joining in pouring forth the same prayers, one with another and one for another, the same confession of sin, the same supplications for mercy and grace, the same thanksgivings and hymns of praise. But how, it may be askt, can a Liturgy be upheld, unless there be uniformity in its observance? That it may subsist for centuries, and be a great blessing to a nation, with something far short of absolute uniformity, is sufficiently proved by the history of our own Church since the Reformation: for in spite of Acts of Parliament, which aimed at moral impossibilities, it is notorious that diversities of practice in sundry respects have prevailed. In essentials indeed, in all that pertains to the foundations of the Christian faith, a difference may involve a severance from the body of the Church, or at all events rightfully exclude a man from the office of

teaching therein. But it is well known that, on the principal points of doctrine, the original Nonconformists, and the bulk of those who have been called the Orthodox Dissenters, have readily assented to the tenets of our Articles, and to the spirit of the chief part of our Liturgy. The differences and controversies have almost all been on secondary points, and for the main part with regard to matters acknowledged to be indifferent. Yet, as the conferences on these questions were conducted on the general assumption that uniformity was indispensable, they were utterly useless. The dominant party brought forward what they deemed, and what commonly were, sufficient arguments to justify the establisht practice; and then they thought they had done all they were called upon to do. Few things are sadder than the records of those conferences. They display learning, ingenuity, logical and sophistical dexterity, but hardly a gleam of Christian spirit, of that gentleness, meekness, forbearance, or of that desire for peace and unity, which ought to have presided at them. Hence the remonstrants were dismist unconvinced, and rather confirmed than shaken in their opposition. Whereas, if the right order had not been inverted, —if the parties in the conference had set before their minds that their aim should be to cherish unity, instead of enforcing uniformity,—if they had rightly understood that the blessing of a Liturgy is not, that it makes the whole congregation repeat the same words, and go through the same postures and gestures, but that it touches their hearts with the same live coal from the altar, and unites them in the consciousness of the same need, the same weakness, the same frailty, in the same cry for mercy and help, in the assurance of the same gracious deliverance,

and in the same songs of thankfulness and praise, — surely it would have been recognized that the primary ought not to be sacrificed to the secondary, the essential to the indifferent; it would have been felt that whatever tended to disturb and mar this heavenly unity ought to be done away. The question would no longer have been, can we find a sufficient authority in antiquity, or in the reason of things, to justify this practice? but, is this practice of such paramount importance, so intimately bound up with the life of Christian truth, that we must rather cast our brethren out of the Church, than allow them to remain in the Church, if they will not conform to it? Had there been anything like such a hearty desire to remove the stumblingblocks, the chief part of them would have been removed. I do not mean that the Nonconformists ought to have been allowed to remodel the Prayerbook at will, or to expunge or alter any parts of it that were dear to the rest of the Church. But how easy would it have been to have introduced a few more double forms, leaving it to the discretion of the minister to choose which he preferred! In fact this very course, which otherwise would doubtless be branded as a device of modern liberalism, is pointed out explicitly in the King's admirable Declaration above referred to. Some may fancy that such diversities of practice between neighbouring parishes would have led to disputes; and you yourself seem to favour such a notion, when you say that, "if we lack inward unity among ourselves, still there is no reason why we should inflict the visible tokens of our disunion upon the flocks committed to our charge." For my own part however, I am persuaded that, were it not for the meddling cravers after uniformity, our flocks would pay little heed to such

diversities of practice, at least if we are careful to feed them with that which is more substantial. You probably remember Jeremy Taylor's excellent remarks on a kindred subject at the beginning of his *Liberty of Prophesying:* still you will not forbid my quoting words so full of mild wisdom, written in a spirit so congenial to your own. "We see that in many things, and those of great concernment, men allow to themselves and to each other a liberty of disagreeing, and no hurt neither. If diversity of opinions were of itself the cause of mischiefs, it would be so ever; but that we see it is not. For there are disputes in Christendom concerning matters of greater concernment than most of those opinions that distinguish sects and make factions; and yet, because men are permitted to differ in those great matters, such evils are not consequent to such differences, as are to the uncharitable managing of smaller and more inconsiderable questions. It is of greater consequence to believe right in the question of the validity or invalidity of a deathbed repentance, than to believe aright in the question of purgatory; and the consequences of the doctrine of predetermination are of deeper and more material consideration, than the products of the belief of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of private masses: and yet these great concernments, where a liberty of prophesying in these questions hath been permitted, have made no distinct communion, no sects of Christians; and the others have; and so have these too in those places where they have peremptorily been determined on either side. Since then, if men are quiet and charitable in some disagreeings, that then and there the inconvenience ceases; if they were so in all others, where lawfully they might,—and they may in most,—Christendom should be no longer rent in pieces,

but would be redintegrated in a new Pentecost." These words apply with still greater force to such matters as are merely ceremonial; with regard to which, disputes so readily flare up, because the grounds of them strike upon the senses and cannot be overlookt, and because all manner of persons are hence easily led to take part in them. And surely we might learn this lesson at least from the discrepancies in the Gospels, that differences of the letter are immaterial when the spirit is one. Even in the two records of the Lord's Prayer, brief as it is, there are diversities: for the Spirit of God is more careful to guide the thoughts of the heart, than the words of the lips.

I know, they who desire to act in the manner here recommended, are sure to be met with those stupid and mischievous saws, that one concession brings on another, and that, when you have once begun to give way and to change, you can never tell where you will be able to stop. Harmless as these sayings may seem in their utter fatuity, it is difficult to estimate the mass of injury they have done to mankind. By means of them pride and indolence and obstinacy have bolstered themselves up in their favorite system of inertness, gaining the too ready concurrence of the timid and feebleminded good. Nor have these sayings, when listened to, ever failed to justify themselves. For they withhold men from conceding, until the concession is extorted from them: and then it is yielded grudgingly, reluctantly; it does not come as an act of grace, and thus carries no grace to the receivers; who, irritated by long contention, and having learnt their own strength from the constraint they have exercised over their adversaries, have been prepared to crave for more, and

emboldened to insist upon it. Surely a wise man will say, *If a concession ought to be made, let me make it forthwith, and thus gain that only real strength which arises from being in the right. Then, should a concession which ought not to be made, be demanded of me, the very strength accruing to me from this act will better enable me to refuse it.* O that people could be brought to believe that right is always might, and that wrong is always weakness!

In the remarks which I have allowed myself to make on the Acts of Uniformity, you may perhaps think I have been proceeding on a misconception of your meaning; for that you never intended to express, nor do your words imply, any approval of a compulsory uniformity, as a means to unity, but merely of such a uniformity as shall result from the voluntary sacrifice of individual prejudices and predilections, out of deference to authority, and from the desire of peace and concord. I know it, my friend: the kindness of your heart would shrink from penalties to enforce uniformity, while your conviction of the spiritual character of Christian truth would discern that such measures are repugnant to the Gospel, and no less inefficient for producing their designed effect, than the chains of the demoniac among the tombs were to restore him to his right mind. Still the Acts of Uniformity, as appears on the face of them, with all their disastrous effects, were founded in great measure on the very opinion which you have been maintaining, that uniformity is indispensable to unity, and a means to it. And though it is a happy privilege of the meek and pious, that errours of human opinion, however firmly held by them intellectually, will be counteracted and neutralized by the higher wisdom of the heart, yet in

ordinary minds such errours beget restless wishes to realize false ideals; and when a man of arbitrary temper, like Laud, is invested with authority, they lead him, if they fall in with the bent of his mind, to work much mischief. Hence it seems to me that no slight service would be rendered to the Church, if any one could help toward setting men's minds right on the relation between unity and uniformity, and toward exploding the noxious errour that uniformity is indispensable to unity. For though the abovementioned illustrations of the mischiefs which this errour has caused, are taken from bygone ages of our Church, the need of the warning which they hold out is not gone by. At this day far too many persons are harassing themselves and their neighbours through their anxiety to establish a strict uniformity: too many are magnifying rites and ceremonies, vestments and postures, as if these were the essentials of Christian worship, and as if the peace of the Church might be compromised for the sake of attaining to uniformity in such things. At this day how few understand and recognize the great truth enunciated in the words quoted above, that *differentiae rituum commendant unitatem doctrinae!* Yes, my friend, let us seek unity with all our heart and soul, but not by the way of uniformity, which will never lead to it, but will waste our time by throwing up trippingstones at every other step. Let us rather seek it by those spiritual means which our Lord gave to His Church, by doing what in us lies to draw our brethren more and more to the one Faith in the one Lord through the one Spirit, whereby alone can any be brought to the one God and Father of all. Let us seek it, as our beloved father, Bishop Otter, sought it, by endeavouring

to inspire others with the same love which filled his own breast. The blessings which sprang from his brief episcopate may convince us, if we needed a fresh proof, that this is the true way to seek unity, the more excellent way, which has too commonly been abandoned for the barren, unprofitable way of uniformity.

From him, our beloved father, as I bid you farewell, my thoughts turn to another dear Friend, who has in like manner been taken from us to his reward. He too had the true principle of unity in his heart, the love of God, manifesting itself in overflowing love to man. God has taken him from us to a world where all his yearnings after love and unity will be satisfied; but to us, to this Diocese, the loss is a heavy one; few could be so heavy. At our public Meetings, at which, in this divided and distracted state of our Church, discordant opinions and feelings will sometimes find utterance, it was ever his wont to call us away from these points of contention, and to pour a reconciling spirit over the whole; wherefore, whenever I had anything to do with the arrangement of such Meetings, I endeavoured to manage that our departed friend should close the discussion. For his Christian sincerity and earnestness and love, and his entire freedom from party-spirit, his ready recognition of every spark of divine grace, under whatever form it might shew itself, were known and appreciated by all; and every asperity of feeling was straightway dispelled, as soon as Robert Anderson began to speak. By the following Sermon I am especially reminded of him in more ways than one: for he, in his usual affectionate manner, proposed at our Anniversary Meeting that I should be requested to print it; and since then, with that

gentle playfulness which so well became him, he has several times rallied me for my long delay. Moreover, when I came down from the pulpit, he was the first person who spoke to me; and as his heart was ever longing after that blessed Communion whereby the faithful become one with each other in their Lord, he exclaimed with reference to the wish I had exprest, "*O why are we not going now to kneel before that table, and partake one with another of the blessed Body and Blood of the Saviour?*" Such recollections become precious, when they belong to one, who, we may feel a confident trust, has entered into the perfect Communion of the Saints in the presence of the Lord.

To Bishop Shuttleworth we owe it that the next Anniversary of our Association was no longer destitute of its crowning blessing: and I trust that every fresh Anniversary will in like manner renew and strengthen the holy bond of brotherhood among the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese. In this wish and prayer, you, my dear Friend, I know, will join from the bottom of your soul. And now let me crave your forgiveness for this long, and, I fear, wholly unprecedented Dedication; in which, you will probably say, with one of your placid smiles, I have been quite acting up to my principles, and shewing a grand disdain for everything like uniformity. When I began, I thought a few pages would hold all I had to say; but the deep interest of the subject has led me on: and how many things still remain unsaid, which, it seems to me, might serve to elucidate and establish the propositions I have been attempting to maintain! I have exprest many differences from the opinions you have given utterance to in your Charge; yet I believe the real

difference between us is far less than it would seem. At all events I trust in God that, so long as we are permitted to live and work together, we shall also be permitted to shew practically, that unity may exist without uniformity, and that the diversities of opinion and feeling, which on many subjects prevail between us, will in no wise impair the unity of affection by which we are bound to each other, or our unity of action in the service which we owe to the Church and her Lord. If I may without presumption apply words, which were spoken of wiser and holier men, may the surviver of us be enabled to say, as Archbishop Bramhall said of himself and Ussher, who in like manner differed from him on sundry points of opinion and feeling; "I praise God that we were like the candles in the Levitical temple, looking one toward another, and both toward the stem. We had no contention among us, but who should hate contention most, and pursue the peace of the Church with swiftest paces."

Your affectionate friend,

J. C. Hare.

Whitmonday, 1843.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

Ephesians iv. 4, 5, 6.

There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

The desire of unity is inherent in man. It pervades all the expressions, all the modifications of his being, and may in a manner be termed an elementary principle of his nature. It lies, very often without his being conscious of it, at the bottom of all the workings of his mind, which is ever seeking, in one way or other, to infuse unity into the objects of its contemplation, to bring them under one head, to arrange them under one law, to find out some analogy, some relation, some likeness and harmony amongst them. Hence it manifests itself more or less in the whole structure of language, in the speech of the rudest tribes, as well as of the most refined. For the whole of language, even among the rudest tribes, is made up of general terms; that is, of words which do not merely stand for one single act or object, but are common to several, and which always imply certain processes whereby the mind has exerted its unifying power in classing a number under one head. Every one who has wateht the development of the minds of children, must have noticed how rapid and powerful this unifying spirit is in them,

how eagerly they exercise their childish royalty in bringing things together in new associations and combinations. On the other hand the faculty of detecting differences is less vivid in them. As that does not spring from an inward principle, but is rather forced upon the mind by the observation of outward objects, it requires the training and discipline of experience, and thus belongs to the wisdom of practical life, beyond which few are allowed to soar. Nevertheless in this, as in so many other respects, the highest wisdom returns to that, which had been the instinctive utterance of childhood; and while the efforts of all Science are to discover and demonstrate the unity of the laws of nature, the might of Poetry is displayed in investing all things with a unity of feeling, and Philosophy is ever yearning and seeking after the one allpervading principle of the universe.

That this desire of beholding unity in all things arises from that unity of consciousness, in which man was made, and in which his Maker mirrored His own unity, cannot well be doubted. But while we have this principle of unity within us, we are set in the midst of a world, in which everything, when we first look out over it, seems to jar and war against all unity, a world which at first sight may seem to be just emerging or subsiding out of Chaos. The character of the outward world, as it presents itself to our senses, is not unity, but multitude. It rushes upon us wave after wave, with a confused noise of many waters, entering into our minds by every inlet, taking possession of us, and almost overwhelming us. Its name is Legion. We try to bind it; but it bursts our chains. We strive with all the craft of our understanding, we send out the whole host of our faculties, to reduce it to unity:

for a while it seems to submit; we flatter ourselves that our object is effected: when anon we perceive that a thread in our network has slipt, whereby the whole unravels, and all the treasures, which we deemed secured in it, are scattered abroad.

The principle, I said, which leads and compells us to seek for unity in all the objects of our contemplation, notwithstanding the diversity and multiplicity and contrariety wherewith they assail us, is the unity of our consciousness, in which our Divine Maker mirrored the unity of His own being. Accordingly it is only so far as we retain this true unity in ourselves, that we can succeed in discovering a living unity without us. That there must be an essential unity pervading all God's works, is implied indeed in the very fact of their being His works. Even in man's works, in the works of the same man, there is a unity, whereby they reveal the mind they spring from; though, as in all men there is more or less of disorder and distraction, the harmony in all has been marred and is incomplete. In a far higher degree then must there be a unity running through all the works of Him who is essentially and entirely and indivisibly and eternally One. But this true unity we cannot make out, unless we gain sight of its principle, unless we have hold of the only clue with the aid of which we can explore the multitudinous chambers in the endless labyrinth of the universe, — unless we can trace back the countless streams of life to their one primary source in the Wisdom and Goodness of their Author. Cut off from this source, they seem unconnected, vagrant, often opposite. Hence there are two main causes, through the combined operation of which we are apt to miss unity; and no man has ever

lived, over whom these two causes have not both of them continually exercised more or less sway. Both of them are the results of that separation from God, of that depravation of the Divine Idea in man, which took place at the Fall; unless it would be more correct to say that they are both parts of that very act through which man fell.

The first of these two causes lies in that departure and estrangement from God, whereby man has set up his own will in the place of God's will, his own wisdom in place of God's wisdom, and has sought in his own understanding for the key to the mysteries of the universe, instead of endeavouring to ascertain the mind of God by a patient and diligent examination of the various manifestations wherein that mind is revealed. Thus man quitted the true centre of truth, and took his stand at a false centre, even his own individual self, and so, looking from that false centre, saw everything distorted, disproportioned, out of place, and in confusion. This proneness to take a false centre,—to set up ourselves as the centre of all things, round which all things are to revolve, to which all things are to be subordinate, and for the sake of which all things were made,—is so strong in our fallen nature, that in no respect can it be overcome, unless by laborious and long-continued experience and reflexion. The most conspicuous example of this propensity, which the history of human knowledge presents, is the well-known one of the Ptolemaic system of the universe; which, starting from the self-centring notion, that this earth, the habitation of man, must needs be the centre of the heavenly sphere,—a notion universal and almost indelible,—endeavoured with singular ingenuity to account for all the phenomena of

the heavens on this erroneous hypothesis. In this case however the fallacy is one, which the nature of our consciousness and that of our perceptive organs force upon us. It is one common to all mankind, resulting inevitably from their position and constitution; and since it is but slightly connected with the will, or referable to any moral obliquity, no mischief of importance has accrued from it. Indeed the theory founded thereon enabled men to gain divers correct glimpses of the true unity of the world. Of a far worse character are the errours arising, not from a false position common to all mankind, but from that which is peculiar and individual,—the errours mixt up with individual partialities or antipathies, springing from national or local prejudices, from those of a class, of a form of government, of a sect. In all these and sundry other ways, man has ever been apt to make himself the centre of all things, to make the accidents of his own condition the canon of right and wrong, so that whatever agrees with his own circumstances is to be admired and approved, whatever differs from them is to be reprobated and condemned. Our own form of government, we assume and proclaim, is the only good form of government; our own laws are the only wise laws; our own creed is the only true creed; and whatever differs from it is not only false intellectually, but implies a vicious and degraded state of mind. Nay, even the caprices of our manners, and the very fashions of our dress, we magnify, so as to look with displeasure on everything that does not accord with them. In these feelings and thoughts, as in all that are widely diffused, there is an element of truth; else they could not have gained their currency: in all coin, however mixt with alloy, there is a portion of the

genuine metal. It is right and fitting that we should prize and love and be thankful for the manifold blessings with which the goodness of God has surrounded us in this world. It is right and fitting that we should love our country, our home, the home of our fathers, the laws and institutions under which they and we have grown up, the Church in which God has placed us, with all its rites and ordinances. We should love these blessings thankfully, faithfully, fervently, devotedly, so as to count it an honour and privilege if we are permitted to offer up any sacrifice, even that of our lives, in defending and preserving them. Allowably too may we *take pleasure in the stones* of our country, and *favour the dust* thereof. That which is wrong and blameworthy and injurious, is not our love and admiration for our own country, but our dislike and reprobation of other countries, not that which is positive in our feelings, but that which is negative and exclusive, not our attachment to that which we know, but our contempt for that of which we are ignorant. It is, that our light, after the manner of earthly lights, only sets forth and glorifies itself, and the objects immediately around, throwing the distance into thicker darkness, instead of being diffusive, like heavenly lights, and irradiating all things. Nor is this negative portion of our feelings at all requisite, as some may narrowmindedly suppose, for the support of the positive. Even if we wanted a crutch to lean on, we should not strengthen our footing by using our crutch as a club to strike with. The fact is, this tendency to despise that which we have not, does not proceed from any genuine, deep, reverent love for that which we have: love *envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not easily puffed up.* The spirit I have been speaking of is

much more nearly akin to that vanity and self-importance, which identifies all its circumstances with itself, and hence regards every deviation from those circumstances as a personal affront and offense. If we English are so notorious among the nations of Europe for our insolent bearing toward foreiners, surely we are no less notorious for our political squabbles and animosities, for our religious feuds and antipathies, and for a general spirit of dissatisfaction at home. Whereas, if our love were rightly principled, and referred its objects to their true source, it would likewise observe its due proportions. While we loved God as the Author and Giver of all our blessings, and were especially thankful to him for all those gifts, which He has poured out so bountifully upon us, and which so far exceed our deserts, we should bear in mind that God has other creatures beside ourselves, whom He likewise loves, and likewise vouchsafes to bless. We should bear in mind that His power of blessing is not stinted, like that of the patriarch, who had only one blessing to give; but that His are manifold, yea, without number and end, infinite as His own infinite Wisdom and Goodness; and that, precious and dear as are those which He bestows upon us, those which He bestows upon others are likewise precious as coming from Him, and dear to the persons to whom He gives them.

This then is one of the main causes of errour, spreading far and wide, through every region of thought and action, —of errour, whereby we entirely miss the harmony and unity of truth, and become involved in endless controversies and contradictions. We have strayed away from the One Divine Universal Centre, and have set up a multitude of arbitrary fictitious centres in its stead; so that each

people has its own centre, each class has its own centre, each party and sect has its own centre, nay, each individual man has his own centre; and that is himself. Hence, inasmuch as we all look out from a different point of view, and yet are persuaded that our point of view is the centre of the universe, we all see all things differently: each people has its own system of truth; each class and party and sect has its own system of truth; each individual man has his own system of truth. This too each will maintain, with pen and sword, or, it may be, with anathemas and *autos da fè*, to be the only true system, and that all others are false and counterfeit. Hereby we all fail of attaining to any right principle of unity. Instead of sailing out, as we might do under the guidance of the heavens, with one consent from all parts of the earth on the same great voyage of discovery after truth, we are broken up and scattered hither and thither, with no other help to steer through the darkness, than the reflexion of our own sternlights in the waters. The very faculties of our minds, which were given to us in divers proportions and combinations, to the end that each might bear its appropriate part in the one great work, being infected with the selfish taint, become propagaters of division, while they contend and jangle with each other for the supremacy. The poet asserts that the imagination is the one ennobling faculty in man, and so loses the substantial ground of reality, and bewilders himself among the clouds. The philosopher worships what he calls reason, and entangles himself in the mazes of formal abstractions. The man of the world can recognize no truth except in the practical understanding dealing with the objects of sense, and thus will run round a ring in

the dreary sandy wilderness of utilitarianism, until at length he sinks down exhausted in some epicurean oasis.

Thus we are come to the second great destroyer of unity, and cause of division. The first is our setting up ourselves, our own will, our own fancies, our own notions, as the centre of the universe, instead of the will and mind of God. The second is our having given up our hearts to the creature, instead of the Creator, our having set our affections on earthly things, which are numberless, vague, fleeting, mob-like, and having drawn them away from heavenly things, which roll in imperturbable unison around the eternal throne. When we changed the glory of the incorruptible God into images made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beasts and creeping things, then we lost the source, the principle, the very idea of unity: and as our desires attacht themselves to these things, and our lusts laid hold on them, and our covetousness and ambition tried to seize larger and larger masses of them, they became the occasions of perpetual contention and strife; whence every man's hand and every man's heart was set against his neighbour.

Nor is this division and contrariety merely a division and contrariety between man and man: a like division and contrariety and struggle is found in the heart and soul of each man. When we fell away from God, our hearts and souls were crackt and rent in twain by the violence of the fall. Hence, when we look into ourselves, instead of concord and unity, we see the dark chasm of sin cleaving the soul asunder; and whithersoever we look out of ourselves, we see the reflexion of it stretching across both earth and heaven. Sin, the universal solvent,

breaks up the heart and the mind into a multitude of insulated faculties and feelings; and since its first essential act was the rejection of law,—which is the outward bond, as love is the inward principle, of all union,—it can behold nothing but isolation and desolation around it. Nay, in its audacity it even dared to dissolve the unity of the Divine Idea into a multitude of fictitious deities, deeming nothing too base, nothing too foul, nothing too depraved, to be seated on a throne in the heavens. Thus man was lured and dragged so far away from the only true principle of unity, that he plunged into all the extravagances and all the abominations of Polytheism. Or, if some more thoughtful men, meditating on the traces of unity still left in their own minds, became desirous of seeing a counterpart of that unity in the outward world, they forgot what had marred that unity; they forgot that evil of every kind is utterly incompatible with unity, and destructive of it; and so, in shrinking from the fantastical and revolting absurdities of Polytheism, they fell back into the dead blank of Pantheism.

By these two causes, which pervade and taint all the workings of our fallen being, the desire of unity, which is inherent in man according to the idea of his nature, is thwarted and hindered from realizing itself either in thought or in action. When God said, *The Lord thy God is one God*, the true principle of all unity was proclaimed to mankind: but from this unity man had turned away, when he gave himself up to the love and worship of self, and to the love and worship of the creature. There is still indeed a principle of unity in our understanding, the part of our nature which has suffered the least from the Fall; and by this principle, as we have seen already,

its movements, whether consciously or unconsciously, are swayed and regulated: but all manner of principles of division sprout out of our will, and our ill-governed affections and passions. These, if they were allowed to run riot, would tear the world to tatters; and only by a hard, persevering struggle has the principle of unity been able from the beginning to keep these principles of division in check. It has united men into families: it has united families into nations; it has organized nations into a kind of unity under the authority of one ruling head: it has tried to bind the tumultuous wills and passions of the multitude by the chains of law. The history of these struggles with their various vicissitudes forms the history of the world. The only unity however, that man could attain to in this way, is the negative, outward, abstract, formal unity of the understanding, which masses its objects together by overlooking or repressing whatever individualizes and would keep them apart,—the unity of unicity and of uniformity,—not the unity which discerns the divine central principle in them, and is no way embarrast by the endless variety of its manifestations, but rather rejoices therein, even as we rejoice when we look at the infinite diversity of the constellations in the one starry sky. In families indeed, where the spirit of love has always found the freest play, some approximations have from time to time been made to this higher unity, recognizing the individuality of each several member: but in states almost the only object of governments has been to repress that which would violate unity; and Law has mostly recognized that its office is purely negative, and that its appropriate voice is *Thou shalt not*. When it has aimed at anything beyond this, when it has attempted by human

means to build a tower the top of which should reach to heaven, and which should be a positive centre of union for mankind, the result has proved that it was passing out of its sphere: the band, which was strained too far, has burst; and, instead of unity, there has issued from the attempt multiplied and widened division.

These two causes of division, by which the Spirit of Evil contrived to mar the divine unity of the universe, so far as man has power to do so,—selfwill and the lust of the creature,—have been busy ever since the Fall at their Satanic work, breeding and fostering division and strife; and they are scarcely less busy or less powerful in these days than in the worst times of old. That the selfish principle is still dismally active, we see by divisions even in that Church, which was meant by God to be the reuniter and harmonizer of the world; we see it by all manner of divisions in the State, by divisions in every parish, and almost in every household. Everywhere we find an exaggerated estimate of each man's peculiar habits and usages and opinions, and a grievous want of deference and forbearance toward others, an utter want of that reverence which every man has a right to claim for such doctrines and feelings as are sacred in the eyes of his conscience. All men are convinced that they are thoroughly right, even in the notions and views which they have taken up the most lightly and unreflectingly; and they have just force of logic to draw the inference, which they deem inevitable, that everybody who differs from them must be wrong. Nor is the solvent, insulating power of that delusion, by which man gave up his heart and soul to the things of this world, less powerful or less efficacious than in former ages. Still too it produces the same

fruits,—on the one side Polytheism, or the idolatrous worship of the creature, and of everything about it that fascinates and intoxicates the senses, only stript of that imaginative halo which in some measure elevated the Polytheism of old,—and on the other side Pantheism, with its fatal denial of moral responsibility, its obliteration of the distinction between right and wrong, and its blind prostration before every phantom of power. More especially has this been manifested in the leveling, anarchal spirit, which has been so overweening in the last and in this generation. For Jacobinism is the form which Pantheism naturally takes in political life, when it is not restrained by those feelings and principles of a higher origin, which its more enlightened advocates practically recognize, even while they speculatively reject them. In the civil state, as in the universe, it is anarchal; and having cast away all moral distinctions, and the only true principles of law and order, it would also destroy all civil distinctions, and everything that bears witness to law and order, and to the permanence of rights, in the constitution of society. Surely every one who hears me must be aware in what terrible forms these aboriginal deadly heresies are still shewing themselves, even in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, even in England, which deems itself the favorite seat of all practical wisdom and moral truth.

Now with regard to both these causes we have seen, that the primary reason why they have hindered man from attaining to unity is, that, when he gave himself up to their influence, he abandoned the only true Principle of Unity, and fell away from that Centre, whence alone all things can be seen working together and at one. Thus, whithersoever we look abroad over the earth, if we look

only with the eyes of our natural understanding, we behold nothing like unity and concord, but variety, diversity, multiplicity, contrariety, discord. And if we look into ourselves, into our own hearts and minds, at the utmost we see a crowd of reluctant faculties, bound together in some few men by the iron hoops of a stern will, but much oftener scattered about, and running confusedly to and fro. What then are we to do, in order that we may fulfill our inherent desire of unity? whither are we to go, that we may find a true principle of unity? how are the dashing waves of the world to be quelled and husht? how are the clashing elements of human nature to be harmonized and set at one? To these questions there is only one answer; and that is to be found in those words of the Apostle, which I read to you at the beginning of this Sermon: *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one Hope of your calling: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

As it was in falling away from God that man lost the principle of unity, so it could only be through his being brought back to God, that that principle could be revived within him. He needed to be reconciled to God: he needed to be set at one with God, or atoned. He needed, as we have seen, a twofold atonement: for, as his separation from God had been followed by division within himself, he needed at the same time to be set at one with God, and to be set at one within himself. The manner in which this great work was to be effected, the only way in which it ever was or ever can be effected, is set before us in these words of St Paul. What sublime and wonderful words they are! The Apostle lookt out over the face of the

earth; and what did he see? Nation warring against nation, faction against faction, school against school, man against man, struggling passions, battling interests, plots, snares, fraud, rapacious avarice, insatiable ambition, with the Roman empire waving its sword over the heads of mankind, and awing them into servile torpour, while voluptuousness had relaxt all the traditionary bonds of virtue and moral obligation, so that human nature seemed to be almost crumbling to atoms, or floating like ragged scum on the surface of hell. Even among his own countrymen there were endless dissensions, unceasing feuds. Countless swarms of bodies met the eye; but no spirit breathed life into them. Everything like a spirit that had animated the nations in earlier ages, and infused some sort of unity into them, had fled away. And yet the Apostle, casting his glance over the world, seeing what was not to be seen, and feeling an undoubting assurance of that of which no token appeared, dared to say, *There is one Body, and one Spirit.*

For though these words were addrest primarily to the Christian converts at Ephesus, to certify them that they had been called to a participation in this one Body and this one Spirit, it cannot well be questioned that he, to whom, above all the Apostles, was vouchsafed the glorious vision of the reception and indwelling of the nations in the Body of Christ, — he whose special mission it was to declare that the wall of partition had been taken away, and that there should no longer be Jew or Greek, circumcision or uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, male or female,—that is, that no distinction of nationality, of customs or rites, of civilization, of social condition, or of sex, should in any way obstruct the perfect union and unity of those among whom these distinctions subsisted,—so that,

notwithstanding these distinctions. Christ should be all, and in all, and that through His indwelling they should all be one,—it cannot be questioned that here also the Apostle of the Gentiles was contemplating the reception of all mankind into the one holy Body of Christ. This is the one Body he speaks of: he saw that Christ's Church was to be one Body; and it was to be one Body, because it was to be animated by one Spirit: for thus alone do the material elements of our fleshly bodies become one, through the one living spirit that animates and pervades and organizes them; and when that living spirit has past away, they moulder into dust. But Christ's Church was indeed to be one Body, because it was to be animated by one Spirit, even the Holy Spirit of God, whom the Father sent down from heaven to dwell for ever in the hearts of all such as believe in His Onlybegotten Son. This too is the one hope of our calling, the sanctifying presence of the one Spirit, obtained for us by the merits and intercession of the Eternal Son.

Such, the Apostle saw, was to be the perfect unity of the Church, according to the will of God, who from the beginning purpost to shew forth His own Unity, no less than His own fulness, in the whole created universe. The Church was to be one Body, and one Spirit, one Body animated by the one Spirit of God, according to the one blessed Hope whereunto it had been called, by Him who became incarnate to this end, that all mankind might gather around His all-atoning Cross. We were to be restored to the Unity, which we had forsaken and forfeited. We were to be brought back to the One Eternal Principle of Unity, who is above all, and through all, and who also purpost to be in us all. This however could not be done

immediately. We had turned away from God; we had hidden ourselves from Him; and when He called to us, we fled and hid ourselves more and more in the deep, sunless, pathless forest of the world; we hid ourselves in the groves of an idolatrous Polytheism. To the Jews indeed God had revealed Himself in His Unity. *Hear, O Israel*, He had declared, *the Lord thy God is one Lord.* He had declared also, what followed of necessity from this His eternal Unity, that we, His reasonable creatures, being endowed with the faculty of knowing Him, were bound to love our one God *with all our heart and with all our soul and with all our mind.* But this we could not do with the simplicity and integrity of unbroken innocence: we could not do it even with the entireness with which a child gives its heart to its parents. For we had given up our hearts to the things of this world; and the world had fixt its fangs into them; and we could not free them, except by tearing them away; nor could this be done without blood. Hence the Jews could only approach God through the Law, every command of which was designed, as it were, to free men's hearts from the fangs of the world, to loosen one of the nails whereby man was fastened to the cross of this world. Moreover, as man's departure from the one God was caused by his giving up his heart to the things of this world, God ordained that men should bring offerings of the things of this world to Him, both as an acknowledgement that He was the Lord of the whole material world, no less than of mankind, and as a token that they were bound and were willing to make sacrifice of the things of this world, whereby they had been withdrawn from their communion with the one God, in order that they might be received again into that communion. And as every act of obedience to the Law was

a binding and resigning of selfwill, and every offering was a giving up of the things of this world, so these latter sacrifices further shewed that the former in themselves were incomplete, and required a higher purificatory and sanctificatory power to make up for their deficiencies. They declared that man's obedience by itself could never take away sin; and while his reason and conscience pronounced that the higher could never be purified and sanctified by the lower, and accordingly that the blood of bulls and rams could not take away sin, they were a witness to him that he needed a purification and sanctification beyond himself, and carried his thoughts and hopes and desires onward to the fulfilment of that which they typified and foreshewed.

Thus the one God could not be approacht by the Jews, except through the works of the Law, and through typical sacrifices; and therefore He further declared Himself to be a Consuming Fire. For by the works of the Law no man can approach to God: no man could do so then; no man can do so now. If any man fancies he can approach to God by the works of the Law, the Law is still like the flaming sword of the Cherubim, turning every way, and keeping the way of the Tree of Life. The action of law, as law, is outward, and, if it produces any manner of unity, can only effect this forcibly, by destroying what resists it, and fusing things into one mass. Nor can any man really approach to God by means of types and ordinances, or anything symbolical; he could not then,—nor can he now,—unless he has already been brought nigh to God by the Spirit, enabling him to look through that outward veil, which has ever been so apt to arrest his sight, and to prevent his discerning what lies beyond and behind it. And

thus it came to pass here again, that men lost sight of the Divine Principle of Unity in the multiplicity of commands and observances: here again they turned from the worship of the Creator to the idolatry of the creature, from the reverent, self-sacrificing service of the Lawgiver to the disputatious, self-justifying observance of particular ordinances and ceremonies. For there is but one way in which we can really be brought back to the One God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and who dwells in all His servants; and that way is through the one Lord who has reconciled us to God,—through the one Faith in Him, whereby we receive Him into us,—and through the one Baptism, whereby we are purged from those sins which keep us away from Him, and are made partakers of the gift of the one sanctifying indwelling Spirit.

Through Christ, and through Him alone, we have power given to us to approach to the one God and Father of all. He is the Fulfilment of the Law, so that the Law shall no longer keep us away from God, entangled in its meshes. He is likewise the Fulfilment of the types and rites, so that, after we have beheld His glory, we can no longer be deluded by phantoms and shadows into mistaking them for realities. When He was lifted up on high, He was to draw all men to Him, teaching them by the lesson of His cross, that they were to draw nigh to God, not by this work or that work, not by the sacrifice of this thing or that thing,—for that all partial obedience and service left them in their state of disunion and separation,—but by the entire sacrifice and resignation of their whole being to the will of God. In Him, the one Lord, the invisible Godhead dwelt visibly upon earth: in Him, the second Adam, the divine image was renewed, to be communicated

to the fallen race sprung from the first Adam. In Him, the one Head, and through Him, the Church becomes one Body, and receives the one Spirit to abide in it.

And how are we made partakers of the Unity which Christ came to bring back to us? By Faith; by the one Faith, whereby we receive Him into our hearts as our Saviour, as our Mediator, as our Atonement, as the one Incarnate God, through whom our human nature is restored to its communion with the divine; by that Faith, which, according to our Lord's last command, was to precede the baptismal purification and renewal of the believer.

But while we continue under the dominion of sin, and under the condemnation incurred by it, Faith is almost powerless. The moment the eyes of Faith are unsealed, it recognizes its own blindness and feebleness: its first utterance is, *Help my unbelief.* Therefore, in order to vivify our Faith, our one Lord instituted His one Baptism, the Baptism in the name of the one undivided Trinity, wherein by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body.

Thus, being led by our one Lord, and united to Him by one Faith, and incorporated into His Body by one Baptism, we are enabled to approach to the one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.

These then, we are authorized to declare, are the essential, indispensable principles of Unity in that Body of Christ, which is ordained to embrace all nations and kindreds and languages. And the Unity thus infused into us is to be maintained by that Communion in the Body of Christ, wherein, as the Bread is one, we, being many, become one Body. Without these there can be no unity. Without

these we cannot be reunited to God; and therefore we cannot have any stable principle of unity, powerful enough to calm and harmonize the discordant elements of our nature, and to sway the course of our lives among the manifold forces which would drive us this way and that. But when we are brought nigh to God in this manner, we are no longer left to the various precepts of the Law, which merely teach us to coast the skirts of the land of Duty. The one principle of Love, which alone fulfills the Law, and which spreads and branches out through our whole being, as the living source of a diviner law, is revealed to us; and under its calm and mighty impulses we may sail across the wide ocean, and circumnavigate the globe.

These are the living principles of unity in the Church, whereby the Church is made one with her Lord: these are the primary pervading principles of that unity; and beside these there are no other such. Other ordinances and institutions may be valuable in a secondary and instrumental manner, for the sake of preserving the unity of the Church unimpaired in the midst of an unfriendly and often hostile world,—with a view to the transmission of the one Faith and the one Baptism in their uncorrupted purity from generation to generation,—or in order to the maintenance of order and discipline. But these primary essential principles of unity are to be kept studiously distinct from whatever is secondary and accidental, however important and valuable as an accident. From all such things the principles enumerated by the Apostle are to be carefully distinguisht,—the one Faith, and the one Baptism, whereby we become members of the one Body of our one Lord,

animated by the one Spirit of promise, and thus are brought home and reconciled to the one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in us all.

Nor is this caution superfluous. For as through the whole history of man prior to the birth of Christ we find a universal proneness to substitute the idolatry of the creature for the worship of the Creator,—a proneness betraying its carnal origin by its readiness and zeal in prostrating itself before objects physically the meanest and morally the most corrupt,—in like manner since the birth of Christ, and the setting up of His Church as the antagonist of the world, that Church has in all ages been grievously troubled and disordered by a similar proneness to look at the outward instead of the inward, to set up the secondary on a level with, if not above, the primary, and to cling more tenaciously and passionately to the formal than to the spiritual. This was the case from the very first: the Jews wisht to Judaize the whole Church: so in after times did the Romans wish to Romanize it: much reason therefore have we to beware lest we be infected with a desire of Anglicizing the whole Church, lest we be reluctant to recognize and acknowledge the Church of the Lord, unless her whole stature and gait and garb be exactly the same as we ourselves are familiar with. The contest against this narrow selfish spirit within the Church was a main part of the mission assigned to the great Apostle of the Gentiles: and from him may we best learn to discriminate between those institutions and ordinances which may vary with time and place and national habits and condition, and those principles which are set before us in the text, and without which none can truly be members of the one Body, or animated by the one Spirit.

The time will not allow me to enforce these remarks by the citation of particular instances, in which false conditions of unity have been set up as indispensable in the Church, and which might need some investigation to explain their fallacy, and to trace their mischievous effects. I can do no more than refer to that one instance, which has been the most conspicuous and the most calamitous. And surely you will already have anticipated me in casting your minds back on that period of many centuries, during which the Church of Christ was not content with her one Lord, and her one Faith, and her one Baptism, but, having almost let slip that one Faith in her one invisible Lord, deemed it requisite to have a visible Head, and set up her one Bishop in the same category with her one Lord. Alas, too, we know that this dismal errour is still holding captive a very large part of Christendom, benumbing the spirit, as its natural consequence, with a load of ceremonial and ritual observances, and strengthening the carnal tendency to elevate the outward and visible above the inward and invisible. And though the blessed Reformation was sent by God to redeem the Church from this idolatry, the propensities by which it had been corrupted, were not eradicated thereby, but have shot up from time to time, admonishing us that it is absolutely necessary, so long as we continue in our earthly tabernacle, that we should watch and pray diligently and assiduously against all idolatries, whether of the flesh or of the carnal understanding. So momentous is that lesson, with which the beloved disciple closes his Epistle, a lesson which at first we might incline to think belonged solely to long extinct ages, but which, foreseeing what an ever-sprouting crop of idolatries would in all ages contend with the love of Christ, and try

to supplant it in the hearts of His professing followers, he bequeathed with the emphasis of last words to the Church, *Little children, keep yourselves from idols.* Assuredly too we have great need of this lesson in our days,—no age ever had greater, — although by different classes it is needed in different, and almost opposite directions. For while the world is rioting unrestrainedly in numberless kinds of idolatry,—in the idolatry of the flesh, in the idolatry of Mammon, in the idolatry of machinery, in the idolatry of power, in the idolatry of the gifts of the understanding, and of the works of the understanding, in the idolatry of luxury and ease and comfort, and in every other form of the idolatry of self,—at the same time, in order to counteract these grosser worldly idolatries, which have been sprouting up in these latter years no less rankly than the giants were fabled of old to have sprung out of the first teeming throes of the elements, it has been ordained that we should return, after a long period of indifference and laxity, to a higher appreciation of whatever is valuable and venerable in the institutions and ordinances of the Church. Hence we are again exposed to a danger, which is more formidable to the Church than all the idolatries of the world, because it paralyses the arm wherewith we are to combat and cast down those idolatries, — the danger of cherishing new or antiquated forms of idolatry within our own bosom; the more so as the very impetus of a rebound is apt to carry people into an opposite excess; while they seem to themselves to be merely discharging a debt, in fondling and exaggerating what has been unduly neglected and depreciated. Thus we are especially likely to revive the old errour of placing other conditions of unity on a par with the apostolic principles, the one Faith and

the one Baptism, whereby, through the power of the one Spirit, we are incorporated into the one Body of Christ, and reconciled by Him to the one God and Father of all.

For still the selfish spirit is at work, and as busy as ever. The self-glorifying negative spirit, which magnifies all the circumstances of its own condition, and despises and condemns whatever differs from them, is quite as active in this generation, as in the most narrowminded of those that have past away; and in no country does it exercise a greater sway than in England. We are still very apt to believe that God made and redeemed the world for us only, not for us along with the rest of His Church, but merely for us, and for those who agree with us, so far as they do agree with us. Still in the stiffness of our minds we find it hard to conceive how unity can mean anything but unicity; whereas the higher idea of unity is that which is identical with universality or catholicity. The one Church, which is the one Body animated by the one Spirit, is the universal catholic Church, comprising all who are united to Christ by the one Faith in Him, and the one Baptism ordained by Him; even as the One God and Father of all, who is above all, is also through all, and in us all. We know how it ever has been, and still is a great stumblingblock to the understanding to recognize the mysterious union of the Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead. The understanding can comprehend one, as a unit standing by itself, but not as unity embracing the fulness of all things; whereas the unity of the Church is a divine unity, the unity of infinite fulness. Therefore St Paul, after the verses in which he speaks of the unity of the Church, and of the principles and conditions of that unity, goes on to declare, that this unity of the Church implies a diversity

of gifts: *But to each one of us is given grace according to the measure in which Christ gives it.* And then, having set forth the great power and glory of Him from whom these manifold gifts come, how they came from Him who had ascended up on high, and led captivity captive, and who thereby shewed that He had previously come from the place whither He reascended, *far above all heavens, that He might fill all things*, St Paul goes on to enumerate some of the gifts which He had given to His Church: *He gave some to be apostles,—and some, prophets,—and some, evangelists,—and some, pastors and teachers,—for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, until we all come to the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, to perfect manhood, to the state when Christ shall be fully formed in our hearts.*

In selecting this subject, brethren, as one which would be appropriate for this occasion of our solemn meeting, I was chiefly influenced by the reflexion that the purpose for which this meeting is assembled, the purpose for which our Association was originally establisht, was to realize, and in some measure to fulfill that unity, to which the Church of Christ is called, that unity which, so far as the Church is indeed the Body of Christ, must needs be one of its chief characteristics. The bands of that unity had been sadly relaxt. Slender evidence was to be seen in our Church, during the last century, of the one Body that it ought to have been,—still slenderer of the one Spirit that ought to have animated it. For why! it held but loosely to the one Faith: it had many faiths, if that word would admit of plurality: each man had his own faith, more or less remote from that which unites the Body of Christ to its Head, a faith in many lords, of whom Christ might be

one, and perhaps nominally the chief. Hence men, having lost the one centre of unity and of union, sought to unite around other centres of their own devising. Many asserted that interest was the only true centre of human nature, that it was the living centre of every man's heart, and that a clever conjuror might make it a centre whereby nations also might be held together. Others brought forward some fantastical or fanatical maxim as a principle of union. Instead of clustering round centres of love, people coagulated round centres of hatred. Their watchword was *Death to all who will not join us.* Of these conspiracies and combinations there were many at the close of the last century; and the same combining spirit is wofully active in this land now. Men combine to carry some scheme of their own, to realize some notion, to enforce some union. They are rightly convinced that strength lies in union; but not knowing the only living principles of union, they fail of attaining to it. So too must all fail, so must the statecraftsmen of our days fail, who deem they can hold men together by the ties of interest. The principles and feelings which united men in days of old, patriotism, loyalty, the love of freedom, were living principles, and had a power over the heart and soul: they gave men a centre out of themselves, and attacht them thereto. Thus they had force to suppress and almost extinguish lesser personal motives, and to make men encounter hardships, submit to sacrifices, exercise selfdenial. But interest has no power to awaken any heroic feeling: it can extract no sacrifices, no selfdenial; or, if it does, they are a mere mockery. Therefore the attempt, which is accounted the consummation of modern wisdom, to render a people obedient to the laws by convincing them that it is their

interest to be so, is like binding the strong man with withes, which anon he starts up and rends asunder. Most thankful indeed should we be that this is so,—that interest has not the power to curb man's will, and to tame his passions,—that his nature, in spite of its corruption, is still too noble to sink quietly into such abject bondage. We should give God thanks that no earthly motive can bind men lastingly together, and that selfishness cannot do otherwise than sever them, from the first in heart and spirit, and sooner or later in act also: for terrible would be the power of evil, if it did not thus contain the germs of its own dissolution. We should give God thanks that it is impossible for men to be cemented in a lasting indissoluble union by any feebler power than the Love which proceeds from Him, and which the One Spirit infuses into the One Body of Christ.

But while men are combining on all sides for worldly, and not seldom for plainly evil and lawless purposes, the Church also has been reminded of her own unity, has been roused out of her languid torpour, has been bracing her limbs anew, and gathering her members together. As her principle is unity, her form ought to be union; and it is only by and through the union of her members that her great ends can be accomplisht, this union itself being one of the first and greatest, as is proved by the earnest desire for it exprest in her Lord's last prayer. Hence in the early ages of the Church, when the One Spirit was poured out with that abundance which was indispensable for the work of establishing her foundations, men were so entirely delivered from their inborn selfishness, that they laid their possessions at the feet of the Apostles, deeming the whole of their substance a slight return for

the priceless blessings which they had received. *And the multitude of them that believed*, the Evangelist tells us, *were of one heart and one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possest was his own; but they had all things common. And continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they ate their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.* In this simple account we see what perfect unity the love of Christ ought to produce in His disciples, and how this unity ought to manifest itself, by the removal and giving up of everything whereby men in their natural state are kept asunder. Now it is as an attempt to renew something like this feeling of unity in the One Body of Christ, to revive a faint and distant likeness of this union, that we rejoice and are thankful for the establishment of our Association. It is merely a beginning, a first attempt, a very remote approximation, but still it is an attempt to lead the members of our Church in this Diocese, all her members, lay as well as clerical, to feel that they are indeed members of the One Body of Christ, to lead them to feel that, as such, it behoves them to help and minister to each other, that, as such, they ought not to live to themselves, but to each other and to God. The spirit of Charity, as manifesting itself in noble works to the glory of God, and in a largehearted bounty to the poor, had waxt faint in the land. The spirit of Mammon had become so powerful, and had wrestled so mightily and craftily against it, and had assailed it with such an ever-increasing swarm of luxuries and vanities, that Charity was hardly able to lift up its head. Even the rich, if they gave a few shillings now and then in casual alms, and subscribed their yearly guinea to one or two

beneficent institutions, deemed that they had fulfilled their duty. And are there not many who think so still? are there not many who even fall short of this? Meanwhile few had a notion that it behoved them to relieve any other than the grosser physical wants of their neighbours: moral and spiritual wants were scarcely taken count of by the great majority of those to whose stewardship the riches of England had been committed. And the pious men, who effected so much in the latter part of the last, and at the beginning of this century, for the revival of a higher spiritual life in England, as their views of religion revolved almost entirely about the wants and hopes of the individual soul, and as they found little answerable to their own feelings in the main body of our Church, although they were zealous, as every true Christian must be, to promote charitable works, were thus led by circumstances, as well as by the peculiar character of their religion, to form societies composed of unconnected individuals, who took an interest in the furtherance of godliness, from all parts of the country. But as these societies emanated from persons invested with no ecclesiastical authority, they could not be connected with our ecclesiastical organization: nor could they take advantage of the means afforded by our ecclesiastical system for bringing home the duties of Christian liberality to every member of the English Church. Now this is the end which our Association is designed to accomplish. It addresses itself to the whole body of the Church in this Diocese: it desires to embrace every member of the Church, all who have anything to give for the promotion of God's glory in the well-being of His people, and all who have any spiritual want to be relieved. Its object, according to

the purpose of its pious and benevolent founder, is to remind us that the members of Christ have not merely bodies, but souls also, to be taken care of, souls to be trained from their childhood in the knowledge and love of God, souls to be fed with the bread of life, when they come to maturity. It admonishes us of these wants, and tells us that it is a momentous part of our duty, and that we ought to esteem it a blessed part of our Christian privileges, to contribute of our substance, so that Christ's poor may not perish for lack of those blessings which He came to give them.

Toward the accomplishment of these works something has been done already; a beginning has been made; and therefore we rejoice. But we trust that it is only a beginning; or our joy will be turned into sorrow. We trust that we are to mount from strength to strength; else we shall sink from strength to weakness. Every undertaking has a period of bloom in its spring; the novelty awakens an interest; the energy of the founder imparts itself to those around him. But the novelty passes away, and with it the excitement; the energy, which was merely caught from the reflexion of another's, fades: and unless there is some higher principle to uphold it, the undertaking gradually and not slowly decays. Therefore are we met together in the house of God today, to confess the one Faith, whereby we are united to our one Lord, and to seek access through Him to the One God and Father of all. As by the One Baptism we have been incorporated into the One Body of Christ, we are assembled to profess ourselves members of that One Body, and to pray for a more plenteous outpouring of the One Spirit upon ourselves and upon the whole Church, so that we

may indeed be living members of Christ's Body, knit together by love, and ministering to each other in lowliness and joy. We are assembled together after the example of the first Christians, who *continued daily with one accord in the temple:* and would it not be well that we should follow their example still further, by *breaking bread*, so that we might be strengthened for our work of charity by the spiritual nourishment of the Body and Blood of the Saviour? As there is no perfect union without communion, would it not be well that, on this only occasion when the whole Diocese is gathered together in the presence of its spiritual Father, for works of charity and for the edifying of the Church, we should perfect our feeling of unity by Communion at the Table of the Lord?

Moreover, if we are indeed One Body, if we desire and trust that One Spirit is animating us, if we have set One Hope of our calling before us, what manner of men ought we to be in all our dealings with each other? How ought we to speak of each other? How ought we to think of each other? Brethren, I beseech you, ponder this thought. If we are indeed One Body in Christ, and animated by the One Holy Spirit of God, ought we not likewise to be of one heart and of one soul and of one mind! And yet there are dissensions and divisions amongst us; and yet there are parties in the Church. Contradictory as the words are, there are parties in that Church, which calls itself, and ought to be, the One Body of Christ. Consider what it is, when there are divisions in the body, when limb is torn from limb, when a gash is hewn across the trunk. Does not the body perish? So too must it be, after a kind at least, with the Church.

A divided Church cannot be the One Body, cannot be animated by the One Spirit of Christ. It may indeed happen that a wound will at times prove salutary to a diseased body: the morbid humours may gather in it, and escape through it. But the wound must not continue to fester, or the body dies. When the Church was grown torpid, the revival of animation might unavoidably be accompanied by some convulsive throes: it might again be necessary, as of old, that He who came to send peace, should begin by sending a sword: but His desire and purpose was to send peace. Though the tumultuous tossing and raging of the waves is better than stagnation, that tossing also is only to be for a time. The Sun of Righteousness cannot be mirrored in that tossing: He can only be mirrored in the calm and peace of the waters. Let us then earnestly seek peace through Him, the peace which He alone can give, the peace which proceeds from His righteousness, which is given to all such as are made partakers of His righteousness, the peace which sets us at one with the One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all; which peace if we have, we must needs be at peace also with each other. To Him, in the Unity of the eternal Trinity, be glory in the Church throughout all ages, in earth and in heaven, world without end.

The line of argument in the early part of this Sermon is very like that pursued by Mr Gladstone in the second chapter of his work *On the State in its relations with the Church*, §§ 13—18; and several of the illustrations are the same. Indeed when I was reading the last edition of Mr Gladstone's book, after my Sermon had been printed, I was so struck by the similarity, that I fancied some unconscious reminiscence of his argument must have been working in my mind: nor was I convinced of the contrary, until I found that the passage referred to is not in Mr Gladstone's first edition, and that my Sermon had been preacht before the publication of his fourth edition. This may serve as a warning against the common proneness to bring forward charges of plagiarism. Numberless similar instances might be produced from writers of the same school in every age of literature; and though my mind has in many respects been trained in a different school from Mr Gladstone's, I believe he would join me in acknowledging the highest obligations to Coleridge, as one of our chief masters of thought.